

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Saturday, the 13th September 1958.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at three of the clock, Mr. Chairman (THE HON. DR. P. V. CHERIAN) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

MR. CHAIRMAN : There are two short notice questions. Let us take them up first.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the statement just laid on the table in answer to one of the short notice questions, viz., Question No. 20-A, runs to 6 pages. We would require some time to go through that statement in order to be able to put our supplementaries. May I, therefore, request you, Mr. Chairman, and the Hon. the Minister for Home that the question may be taken up on the 17th September?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : It is for the Chairman to decide.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Yes, I know. That is why I addressed the request to you both.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have no objection. This question may be postponed to the 17th September.

(Short notice question No. 20-A was accordingly postponed to the 17th September 1958.)

Attack on the passengers at the Kodambakkam Railway station

* 20-B **Short Notice** *Question.*—SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Home be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that there was an attack by a gang on the railway passengers and the railway staff at the Kodambakkam Railway station on Monday, the 8th September 1958;

(*b*) if so, the details thereof; and

(*c*) the steps proposed to be taken by the Government to prevent the recurrence of such incidents in future?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) Seven local bad characters, some of whom were drunk and armed with sticks and sharpened steel blades created a disturbance at Kodambakkam Railway station at about 1-30 p.m. on 8th September 1958. These men entered Chetput Railway Station and got into an electric train proceeding towards Tambaram. When the

train reached Kodambakkam, one of the passengers, whose pocket was picked by one of the above culprits, alighted and went up to the Station Master's room at Kodambakkam. The culprits followed him, threatened the Assistant Station Master when he took up the telephone receiver and assaulted him. They also cut the telephone wire of the control phone. About this time a train proceeding to Beach Station pulled up when two or three of the culprits beat the sides of the train with their sticks and one threatened the driver of the train, and applied the hand brake. The culprits then made away over the eastern parapet wall.

(c) The Railway Police, the C.I.D. and the City Police are taking necessary action to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Is it not a fact that these incidents have taken place in broad daylight? I think similar incidents have also been reported in Mambalam and Nungambakkam also. May I, therefore, request the Government to take some serious steps in conjunction with the Railway authorities to see that such incidents do not recur?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Yes, Sir, these incidents have taken place in broad daylight. There are one or two more incidents as mentioned by the hon. Member. The Government and the Police have been looking into the matter in co-operation with the Railway Police and Railway administration. The whole matter is being looked into by us.

SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Are there not any Police posted as escorts in these trains?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : There are a few guards for the railways, but not at all the railway stations. In fact, there is no Police available in Kodambakkam Railway station.

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : கோடம்பாக்கம் ரயில் நிலையத்திலே ஆகாராறு விளைவித்த கூட்டம், கொள்ளையடிக்கவேண்டும் என்ற நோக்கத்தோடு செய்யும் சதிக் கூட்டத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்களா ? அல்லது, குடிவெறியினால் புத்தியிழந்து இந்தக் குற்றத்தில் இறங்கினார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இரண்டும் சேர்ந்திருக்கலாம். திருடவேண்டுமென்பதற்காகவும் இருக்கலாம். குடித்தால் திருடுவதற்கு இன்னும் கொஞ்சம் பலம் ஏற்படும் என்பதற்காகவும் குடித்து இருக்கலாம்.

அவர்களெல்லாம் சென்னை நகரத்தைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள்தான். வெளியூர்களைச் சேர்ந்தவர்கள் அல்ல.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the Hon. the Minister for Home himself has admitted that there have been one or two more such cases. May I enquire whether it was brought to his notice that a similar incident happened in Peters Road two days back when an aged Muslim going in a rickshaw at about 8 or 9 o'clock was stopped by some persons who took away from him a purse containing Rs. 1,400?

13th September 1958]

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Only just now, I am having the information from the hon. Member.

Sri MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : In view of the occurrence of such incidents which are being reported quite often in the papers, a certain sense of insecurity is prevailing among certain sections of the people. So, will the Government see that such a sense of insecurity does not prevail, by taking effective steps?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I do not think there is such a general sense of insecurity. I would appeal to the hon. Members not to do anything which would tend to create such a scare.

Sri A. M. ALLAPICHAI : Is there anything to show that the passengers in the train did anything to help themselves?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may tell the hon. the Deputy Chairman that the passengers in the train were not attacked by these people.

Sri MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, I take strong objection to the remark made by the Hon. Minister. He said that the Members were trying to do things which would tend to create a sense of insecurity. After all, when such incidents take place, we have to bring them to the notice of the Hon. the Home Minister. However powerful he is, he has no business to cast aspersions and pass such remarks in such a light-hearted manner.

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I submit to you that it is the wish of everyone of us in this House that we should not do anything which would tend to create any sense of insecurity in the minds of the public.

Sri T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN : May I know whether any complaints from the people of Kodambakkam and Nungambakkam, have been received reporting frequent cases of theft in the last twelve months or so?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I would like to have notice. So far as I am aware, no such complaints have been received.

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI : இந்தச் சம்பவம்பற்றித் துப்புக் கண்டு பிடிப்பதற்கு நாய்கள் உபயோகப்படுத்தப்பட்டனவா ?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : எதாவது திருட்டுப் போனால், அதுபற்றிப் புலன் விசாரிப்பதற்கு நாய்கள் உபயோகப்படுத்தப் படுகின்றன.

Sri P. T. RAJAN : May I know whether the Government will be pleased to arm some of the officials of the railways so that they may protect themselves in times of emergency?

The Hon. Sri M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I do not know the exact state of affairs to-day. Unless I know what it is, it will not be possible for me to answer that question, Sir.

[13th September 1958

SRI P. T. RAJAN : My point is this. The incidents such as the one reported in Kodambakkam could not have taken place at least if the railway officials had been provided with fire-arms. At least, they could have effectively scared away the culprits.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have no doubt that the hon. Member will agree with me that fire-arms should not be provided to anyone unless he is trained to use them in a proper manner. If a driver is provided with fire-arms in the manner suggested by the hon. Member, I am not sure that the driver who will be doing his normal work will also be able to use the fire-arm correctly. I do not know whether it is a desirable thing.

Modakuruchi Block Development area

* 21 Q.—SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Will the Hon. the Chief Minister be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is fact that the staff in the Modakuruchi Block Development area, Erode taluk, live outside the area in Erode and if so, the reasons therefor; and

(b) the steps, if any, taken or proposed to be taken in this regard?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN (on behalf of the Hon the Chief Minister) : (a) No. All the members of the staff of Modakuruchi block reside either in Modakuruchi or in one of its hamlets.

(b) Does not arise.

Fertilizer Advisory Committee

* 22 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Home be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have constituted a Fertilizer Advisory Committee; and

(b) if so, the names of members and the functions of the Committee?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The answer [a] is placed on the table of the House.

Nurses in the College of Integrated Medicine

* 23 Q.—SRI A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state whether the nurses employed in the College of Integrated Medicine, Madras, are given any refresher courses in Indigenous Medicine?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : No, Sir. But they are eligible to undergo Refresher Courses in modern medicine like the nurses and head-nurses of other hospitals.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 283 infra.

13th September 1958]

Sri A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR : சித்த வைத்தியக் கல்லூரியில் சித்த வைத்தியம், யுனானி, ஆயுர்வேதம் முதலிய துறைகளில் ஆராய்ச்சி செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற கொள்கையைக் கைக்கொள்வதினாலே, அந்தத் துறையிலேயும் இவர்களுக்கு மறு பயிற்சித் திட்டங்களை வகுத்து, முறையாக அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவர அரசியலார் முற்படுவார்களா ?

The Hon. Sri M. A. MANICKAVELU : மருந்து கொடுக்கிறதிலே சித்த வைத்திய மருந்தாக இருந்தாலும், அல்லோபதி மருந்தாக இருந்தாலும் கொடுக்கிறது ஒரே மாதிரித்தான். ஆனால், 'ரிப்ரஷர் கோர்ஸ்' சில சப்ஜெக்டுகளுக்குத் தான். சைகாலஜி, டையட், வார்ட் அட்மினிஸ்ட்ரேஷன், பெட்யாட்ரிக்ஸ், ஆர்தோபெடிக்ஸ் போன்றவைகளில் தான் 'ரிப்ரஷர்' கோர்ஸ் கொடுக்கப்படுகின்றது.

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM : சித்த வைத்திய நர்சுகள் என்று யாராவது உண்டா ?

Sri A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR : சித்த வைத்தியத்திலே ஆராய்ச்சி செய்வதினால், அந்த ஆராய்ச்சிக்கு வேண்டிய உதவி செய்வதற்காக இந்த மறு பயிற்சி கொடுப்பார்களா ?

The Hon. Sri M. A. MANICKAVELU : மருந்து எடுத்துக் கொடுக்க, சாமான் எடுக்க வார்டு பாய்கள் போதும் ; நர்சுகள் வேண்டியதில்லை.

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI : இந்தக் கல்லூரியின் முதல்வர், 'டீன்' என்று சொல்லப்படுபவர், சமீபத்தில் மாற்றப்பட்டதாகப் பத்திரிகையிலே பார்த்தேன். அதற்கு ஏதாவது காரணம் உண்டா ?

The Hon. Sri M. A. MANICKAVELU : கனம் அங்கத்தினர் நர்ஸிலேயிருந்து டீனுக்குப் போய்விடுகிறார்.

Medium Irrigation Schemes

* 24 *Q.*—**Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM** : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the North Arcot District Planning Board has sent proposals to the Government for investigation of a number of medium irrigation schemes and their inclusion in the Second Five-Year Plan;

(*b*) whether similar proposals have also been received by the Government from other districts; and

(*c*) if so, the action taken for investigation and execution of medium size irrigation schemes throughout the State?

The Hon. Sri P. KAKKAN : (*a*) No, Sir.

(*b*) No, Sir.

(*c*) Does not arise.

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM : Is there any proposal for investigating medium-sized irrigation schemes in our State, Sir?

The Hon. Sri P. KAKKAN : Now, we are investigating them, Sir.

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM : May I know whether the Government have sanctioned the necessary investigation staff for this purpose?

[13th September 1958

THE HON. SRI P. KAKKAN : We have sanctioned the investigation staff, Sir.

Burial-grounds

* 25 *Q.*—SRI M. ETHIRAJALU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of applications received by the District Welfare Officer for the provision of burial-grounds so far in the South Arcot district; and

(*b*) the number of such applications disposed of so far and the number of cases pending and reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI P. KAKKAN : (*a*) & (*b*) A statement [a] is placed on the table of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Questions are over.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

(1) PRESENTATION OF THE FIRST SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE FOR 1958–59.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, I rise to present the Supplementary Statement of Demands for Grants for the current financial year 1958–59 and the Detailed Estimates thereof.

3 10 p.m. The Budget Estimates for 1958–59 were passed by the House in April 1958 and since then, a number of 'New Service' Schemes were sanctioned by the Government for implementation during the current year. The initial expenditure on thirty of these schemes was met by advances from the Contingency Fund. It is proposed through these supplementary estimates to obtain legislative approval for these 'New Service' schemes and have the Contingency Fund recouped.

Though the present Supplementary Estimates relate mainly to 'New Service' Schemes, provision has also been made in a few cases for expenditure which is likely to exceed the provision made in the Budget Estimate for 1958–59.

Out of the total Supplementary Grant of Rs. 195·87 lakhs asked for, Grants amounting to Rs. 61·43 lakhs are for the schemes sanctioned on Revenue Account and the balance of Rs. 134·44 lakhs relate to schemes on Capital and Loan Accounts. Switching over to a programme of Malaria Eradication from Malaria Control, re-survey of Kanyakumari and Coimbatore districts, provision for additional facilities for in-patient treatment in the Government Hospital,

---

[a] Printed as Appendix II on page 284 infra.

13th September 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

Palni, strengthening and the establishment of Regional Post-Graduate Training Centre at the Agricultural College and Research Institute, Coimbatore, are some of the important schemes for which provision is included in the present Supplementary Estimates. Token provision has also been made for payment of grants to new Polytechnics opened by private organizations.

Under Capital Account, a large item of expenditure is shown under "Compensation to Zamindars" (Rs. 46·79 lakhs). The provision represents only an adjustment between Capital and Deposit accounts necessitated by a change of accounting procedure prescribed by the Government of India and hence the expenditure cannot be said to be real. Similarly, the provision of Rs. 37 lakhs made under "Capital Outlay on Irrigation" for the Vidur Reservoir Project is only to meet the requirements under 'Suspense' transactions which will be finally partly wiped out by credits thereunder. The next large item of expenditure occurs under "Capital Outlay on Industrial Development" necessitated by the contribution towards the share capital of Dhrangadhara Chemical Works and Madras Cements, Ltd. The explanatory notes in the detailed supplementary estimates will give the hon. Members detailed information about the scope and necessity for the implementation of the various schemes included in the present Supplementary Estimates.

With these words, I commend the Supplementary Estimates for consideration by the House.

(2) PRESENTATION OF THE STATEMENT OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR EXCESS EXPENDITURE IN THE YEAR 1955–56.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Sir, I rise to present the Statement of Demands for Grants for Excess Expenditure in the year 1955–56. The appropriations originally provided for in the Budget Estimates do not, in the nature of things, tally entirely with the actuals. Excesses under some Grants are inevitable. The total of the excesses in expenditure now sought to be covered by legislative approval is Rs. 273 lakhs roundly against a total final appropriation of Rs. 14,696 lakhs. The explanatory note appended to the Statement of Demands gives the reasons for the excesses in each case. The Public Accounts Committee constituted for the year 1957–58 at its meetings held during the course of the year examined the reasons for the excesses and has recommended in its Report published in April 1958 that Demands for Grants to cover the excess expenditure over the final sanctioned appropriation under each Grant might be presented to the Legislature.

With these words, Sir, I commend for the acceptance of the House the Statement of Demands for Grants for Excess Expenditure in the year 1955–56.

[13th September 1958

III.—NON-OFFICIAL BUSINESS.

A. BILLS.

(1) THE MADRAS PRESERVATION OF PARKS, PLAY-FIELDS AND OPEN SPACES BILL, 1958.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Preservation of Parks, Play-fields and Open Spaces Bill, 1958.

Sir, I am grateful for the opportunity that has been given to me for the third time to introduce this Bill in the House. I hope, Sir, that on this occasion I will meet with a better fate, than I had on previous occasions owing to a variety of circumstances. The Bill which was first introduced on 5th April 1956 had to be withdrawn on the 9th November 1957 and introduced again on the same day. Consequent on the expiration of my term of membership, the Bill has lapsed and now I ask for leave to introduce the Bill again.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

" That leave be granted to introduce the Madras Preservation of Parks, Play-fields and Open Spaces Bill, 1958."

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : I introduce the Bill.

(2) THE MADRAS ESTATES (ABOLITION AND CONVERSION INTO RYOTWARI) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) (Amendment) Bill, 1958.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

" That leave be granted to introduce the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) (Amendment) Bill, 1958."

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Leave having been granted, I beg to introduce the Bill.

(3) THE AGRICULTURISTS' RELIEF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Sir, I beg leave to introduce the Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1958.

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

"That leave be granted to introduce the Agriculturists' Relief (Amendment) Bill, 1958".

The motion was put and carried and leave was granted.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : I introduce the Bill.

B. RESOLUTIONS.

(1) AMENDMENT TO G.O. MS. NO. 1298, HOME, DATED 28TH APRIL 1956.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Adityan is not present in the House.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : I shall move it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Has the hon. Member been authorized? He must make a motion to that effect.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Sir, under rule 144 (3) of the Council Rules, I move—

"That permission be granted to move the Resolution standing in the name of Sri S. T. Adityan."

The motion was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is—

"That permission be granted to move the Resolution standing in the name of Sri S. T. Adityan."

The motion was put and carried.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : I move—

"This Council recommends to the Government to encourage small operators of motor buses, as against fleet-owners and for this purpose the directions contained in G.O. Ms. No. 1298, Home, dated 28th April 1956, for the grant of stage carriage permits be suitably amended so as to (1) suspend, for the next three years, the grant of permits for new bus routes to operators, having more than five buses; (2) set apart, for new entrants, ten per cent of all new routes; (3) omit the words 'other things being equal' occurring in paragraph 2 (4) (1) of the Government Order; (4) allot a minus mark for every bus held by an operator in excess of five buses; and (5) omit the marks for sector qualifications."

The Resolution was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Resolution moved—

"This Council recommends to the Government to encourage small operators of motor buses, as against fleet-owners and for this purpose the directions contained in G.O. Ms. No. 1298, Home,

dated 28th April 1956, for the grant of stage carriage permits be suitably amended so as to (1) suspend, for the next three years, the grant of permits for new bus routes to operators, having more than five buses; (2) set apart, for new entrants, ten per cent of all new routes; (3) omit the words 'other things being equal' occurring in paragraph 2 (4) (1) of the Government Order; (4) allot a minus mark for every bus held by an operator in excess of five buses; and (5) omit the marks for sector qualifications."

3-20 p.m. * SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is a Resolution just to amend the existing Government Order referred to. As it is, there is a great deal of monopoly in the matter of motor industry. Only big fleet-owners get the advantage. With the amendment proposed, there will be new blood introduced and it will be to the advantage of the public as well as those people who are interested in the motor industry. With these few remarks, I commend the Resolution for adoption by the House.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the resolution before the House proposes that G.O. Ms. No. 1298, Home, dated the 28th April 1956, laying down the rules for the grant of stage carriage permits should be suitably amended. I wish to bring to the notice of the House in this connection that the Government Order had already been amended by Order No. 2265, dated the 9th August 1958. In that Order, Government have sanctioned the very proposals adumbrated in the Resolution, namely, that bus routes should be classified into three classes, namely, short routes, medium routes and long routes. Short routes will cover a distance of fifteen miles. For these short routes new entrants are to be preferred. That is the latest Government Order in question. I should like to congratulate the Hon. the Minister for Transport on having introduced this new scheme. We have been complaining that there is no scope for new entrants to come into the field. I am glad that the Hon. Minister Sri Ramaiah has thought it fit to introduce this long-felt and needed reform.

Sir, having said that, I should like to point out that the short distance shuttle service for fifteen miles to be allowed to the new entrants is too short. The distance should be at least 25 miles. Fifteen miles provided in the rules would be too short. It will not be economical for the operators to take up such short routes. I would, therefore, request the Hon. Minister to consider this question and make the distance of the short routes at least 25 miles.

Sir, for medium routes, the distance is fixed at maximum miles 75. All those who are having less than five buses should be permitted to build up a viable unit of at least five buses. Then only it would be economical. I would, therefore, insist on the Government that they should specially consider this problem of small operators having less than five buses and encourage them to build up a viable unit.

13th September 1958] [Sri T. Purushotham]

In this connexion, I should like to point out that Government should consider taking up inter-State and long distance routes. Now, Government have said that routes of 75 to 250 miles will be covered by the fleet-owners, including express service. There are routes newly opened between Madras and Tiruchirappalli, Madras and Salem, Madras and Bangalore and so on. These long distance routes as well as inter-State routes should be nationalized. I am glad that in the case of Nagercoil-Kanyakumari route, the Government have recently decided that it should be taken up as a nationalized Government transport service. I hope that the Government would extend that principle to other long distance routes so that Government could have a network of nationalized transport routes throughout the State.

Though a concession has been shown to new entrants, the latest Government Order issued in the matter introduces a mark system based on sector qualification. For sector qualification one mark is allowed. When new entrants come in, the sector qualification should not be a deciding factor. I believe it is not the intention of the Government that this qualification should be insisted on in respect of new entrants. When these people have no buses at all, there can be no sector qualification. In order to avoid doubts in the matter, I hope the Government will see to it that a circular is issued to all the Regional Transport Authorities that in the case of new entrants for whom short routes of fifteen miles and shuttle service are to be granted, this sector qualification should not be considered at all. I am sure the Hon. Minister will consider this also. I only wanted to bring these few points to the notice of the House and the Hon. Minister in view of the fact that a Resolution on the matter was placed before the House. Thank you, Sir.

Sri K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, without the original Government Order and the other Order mentioned by the hon. Member Sri Purushotham, we could not follow the technical terms such as "sector qualifications", "short routes", "long routes" and other matters referred to by him, intelligently or with interest. (Laughter.)

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM: The principles referred to by me, of course, may be accepted.

Dr. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would not have intervened at all at this stage of the debate but for the remarks of the hon. Member Sri Purushotham. As usual, he has introduced into his speech many controversial subjects, the most important of which is the nationalization of bus routes. I must confess, Sir, it is most unfortunate that in this country everything is viewed from the point of view of nationalization as if it means efficiency and economy. I can say from experience with facts and figures that in many instances this is not the case. But I should like to give one instance of how transport service is worked.

to the benefit of the public. It has nothing to do with the Government, the bus-owners or others. But it has only to do with the convenience of the public.

Sir, the most excellent form of transport is, as the Hon. the Leader of the House will vouchsafe, the bus tarnsport in the United States, namely, the Greyhound buses which run over thousands of miles and not over a hundred and two hundred miles. The hon. Member Sri Purushotham thinks that the bus-owner should have a route of at least 25 miles and not 15 miles as proposed by the Government. He wants that 15 should be made 25. Let us, for God's sake, have better ambitions. Let the bus-owner take his buses at least up to Chingleput, a distance of 35 miles. (Interruption.) The new entrants would like to have breathing space on the route. Apart from that, Sir, let me give an illustration. It is a distance of more than a thousand miles from Chicago to San Francisco, and there are three competitive methods of transport between these two places. One is aeroplane, the other is the rail which is exceedingly comfortable and the third is the 'Greyhound' buses. If anybody were to go to Chicago, he would see these 'Greyhound' buses.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Why are they so called?

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Because they have the picture of the Greyhound racing along so that the public may realize with what speed and efficiency the buses can go.

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI: Our transport buses bear the picture of the 'lion'.

3-30 p.m. DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: What I was going to say was this. The competition between the three forms of transport, all of them by private enterprise, has given the greatest benefit to the passengers concerned. The fare from Chicago to San Francisco is 99 dollars which is equivalent to about Rs. 500. The fare by rail is something like 85 dollars and by the Greyhound bus it is about 75 dollars. The manner in which they calculate the fare is that the air route takes you swiftest. On the other hand, there is no method for meals being supplied on the way. The passenger who goes by rail has to furnish himself with the necessary meals and in the United States, as apart from our country, everybody believes that he must have sufficient amount of the creature comforts wherever he be and to whatever part he may be travelling. So, that little difference between the air fare and the rail fare is meant for those creature comforts. But when it comes to the Greyhound bus, it takes a little longer time not only to take the passenger to the various places but also to give him a beautiful idea of the scenery. That is how transport is developed. Unfortunately, we suffer from that one thing like King Charles' head and it is nationalization. I am sorry that in this context the hon. Member Sri Purushotham should have once

more brought in this nationalization business. All that I would like to say is that it is good to encourage private enterprise. We have been too long condemning private enterprise and, if I may say so, long before the Government realized their duty, it was the private sector that gave us some method of transport in buses. I know of two eminent persons in this line. One is Sri T. V. Sundaram Ayyangar of Madurai and the other is Mr. G. D. Naidu of Coimbatore. I hope, therefore, that this Resolution will not only be accepted but that the Government will improve upon it and see that this sort of transport by the private sector is encouraged, but with the additional safeguards that ought to be made for safe transport.

I have spoken to the Leader of the House about the dangers of night travel in motor cars. I am sure he must have experienced this as many of us have experienced. Till we reach our destination, we do not know whether we will reach home or not. Therefore, I once again say that the danger is even greater in Government transport than in any other transport. It is much greater in respect of lorries. Facts will prove for themselves and no question is necessary on that basis. Although I have repeated time and again that the head-lights must be dimmed over long distance routes, no action has been taken. I stated four years ago that the Government transport should be as liable to the attention of the Police as anybody else. Still the rule is that the Police should not interfere with the Government transport buses.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : I am sorry that is not the fact. Ordinary traffic errors or faults are enquired into by the departmental committee on which the traffic police officer is represented. In all other cases regular action by the Police is taken.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : This was given expression to by the then Inspector-General of Police Mr. Devasahayam in the year 1953 or 1954. I shall be very glad if that information is not based on facts. All that I wish to draw the attention of the Government to is the fact that the danger in regard to transport, particularly transport which is run through the authority of the Government, is much greater than in the transport that is carried on by private concerns. I hope this will be considered by the Government very carefully.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the hon. Member Sri Purushotham has, as usual, brought heat into the discussion by introducing the subject of nationalization. I am not discussing that but that provoked the Leader of the Opposition and rightly to give some good and wholesome advice to the Treasury Benches, particularly, to the Leader of the House, about nationalized bus service. I am not getting into that controversy.

With regard to the Resolution on hand, I think the Minister in charge of Transport will have facts and figures as to what happened in the course of the last ten or fteen years to make the demand

for these bus permits or bus routes go up by leaps and bounds. I think a time there was in pre-War days when bus service was working at a loss. All those who were running one or two buses had almost to withdraw them from service because they could not keep up. But as conditions improved and as the traffic increased and as people also developed the habit of going to the various places either on business or on some other work, the bus transport service became a paying proposition. I hope the Hon. Minister will have facts and figures as to how many new entrants got these bus permits from the year 1946. As far as I know—I am not speaking with any personal information—even people who were having one or two buses went on increasing the number of buses. So, a person who might have been owning three or four buses in 1946 is now called a fleet-owner with a strength of 46 buses. Now, more people have desired to get in. Particularly, in a country like ours where opportunities for business or industry are very limited, naturally there may be certain classes of people who may like to take to the bus service as a business proposition. Therefore, the issue is whether the Government will encourage the policy of going on giving bus permits to those who are already in the line with a fleet-strength of forty or fifty buses or whether they will try to divert at least a portion to new entrants. I am told by the hon. Member Sri Purushotham who sometimes is the spokesman of the Government (Dr. A. Sreenivasan : Always) that the Government have already amended the rules. (Interruption.) I think it is nothing wrong to be a good spokesman. We are told that the Government have already amended that particular rule so that new entrants will also have an opportunity to run a bus service. It is quite possible that the present people who may get one or two permits of this type may also, in course of time, develop. However, the policy is a good one and I surely welcome it. The hon. Member Sri Purushotham will rightly remark about this. I do not know on what basis the Government have come to a decision. But I am sure many Members will agree with me that a certain percentage should be fixed for the new entrants. Otherwise, it would be impossible to carry on. Even the Government of India adopted a similar policy, though not now, in view of the acute, foreign exchange position. For a long time people who were in the trade had a monopoly with regard to export and import permits. After some time, the Government of India amended the rule to the effect that 25 per cent of the quota would be reserved for new entrants. Some such policy on the part of the Madras Government will go a long way in encouraging such people as want to enter business provided they are genuine cases. Sometimes some people would like to have a permit for monetary benefit. I know that the Government will not encourage such tendencies.

Another factor the Government should understand. The new entrant will find it very difficult to compete with the fleet-owners who are having forty or fifty buses. With the buses they have, with the money at their disposal, and with their resources to engage lawyers to fight out their case, it will be very difficult for the new

13th September 1958] [Sri Mohamed Raza Khan]

entrants to compete with the fleet-owners. I feel, in conclusion, that the Government will do well to reserve some portion ranging from 20 to 40 per cent to the new entrants.

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Resolution is brought forward to help more or less private operators as such. Therefore, let us not go into the question of nationalization now. Let me not reply to that point. I shall try to stick to the terms of the Resolution. The hon. Member Sri Mohamed Raza Khan wanted me to inform the House about the number of new entrants into this bus industry from the year 1946. I am happy that there is one Member who has been following the development of this industry for the last twelve or thirteen years. He himself in his speech started to state the position of this industry in the year 1946. None of the Members could have imagined to have such a Resolution then. It was not an attractive industry at all then. There was a lot of competition no doubt among the operators. But it was never considered a paying industry. It was never considered an important industry to be taken up by leading persons or men with sufficient money to run it. It was left to a particular section of people who were normally not well-supported. But the industry has grown up in the course of the last ten or twelve years. It has grown up to such an extent that there is not only a growing demand that more and more people should get into the industry but 3–40 p.m. it has also come to the extent of asking this hon. House to pass a Resolution to amend a particular Government Order in order to allow new entrants to come in. Sir, the Government have, at no time, prevented any new entrants from coming in. But, knowing the nature and the growth of the industry for the past many years and the fact that it has never had a smooth growth or sailing, the Government at one time decided that for an effective or economic operation of bus transport, they must have a minimum of five buses. So, this minimum viable unit was fixed, which the hon. Member Mr. Mohamed Raza Khan himself wants. The Government have been taking many steps to see that this viable unit is built up as quickly as possible. It is to help build up this viable unit that the Government passed that particular Government Order which is sought to be amended by this Resolution. Well, it has its own difficulties. It did work for some time and later on due to the demand from the newcomers to enter the industry, a clash started between the newcomers and the persons who were already well-settled in the industry.

Sir, very often it is stated that it is the bus operator that earns more than any other professional person. It has come to that level. For any small mistake the matter is immediately rushed to the High Court. Sir, on this Government Order, there were some decisions. A particular decision was given by the High Court, which was later on set aside by the Supreme Court. Apart from this Government Order as such, for the past one year or nearly two years, I have received a number of representations that newcomers should not be entirely shut out. I know, from the way this industry has

[Sri V. Ramaiah] [13th September 1958

been growing up, that anyone with initiative, resources and capital can participate in this induscry with success in view of so many improvements made on so many sides.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to what was happening in America. Sir, I am also really dreaming of a period when we can come up to that level. From the way we are progressing, I definitely feel that we will come up to that level or standard. Particularly many of us who only know about this country and this State, who have been in the habit of travelling constantly and who have been watching the progress of this industry, will know the progress that we have made not in the far distant past but in the course of the last ten years, in the matter of road development and transport. About five or ten years ago, the maximum distance permitted for any operator was only 90 miles and he ought to run his buses within 90 miles a day. He could not travel beyond that and the actual distance could only be thirty miles. I know travelling for thirty miles was a big task or venture at that time. To-day it has developed. I have allowed a maximum distance of 180 miles for ordinary buses and 250 miles for express buses per day. We have introduced a number of long-route buses. The demand for long-route buses is ever increasing. We have fixed a distance of 250 miles for long-route buses. As the road conditions improve, it would go up. A number of long-route buses are already plying. Any passenger can get into a bus in Salem and reach Madurai without a change-over or break. This may look very small to those who have seen America, but to us who have seen only this country, it looks that we are making progress. It is quite fast enough. We are attempting to introduce a direct service from Tiruchirappalli to Madras. The demand is large and it is ever growing. It is not as if the Government or the Transport Authority is forcing the operators to take to this service. The demand is coming from them. We can do it safely and comfortably and see how progress is made.

Regarding the Government Order and this Resolution, if I go item by item and if I accept all of them, I will again have to go to the High Court to get it smashed. Instead of helping the poor operator, I will be putting him to greater difficulties and greater hardships. But we are not keeping quiet ever since the Government Order was issued. The difficulties of small operators have been brought to the notice of the Government and I have met various bodies and all those who are interested in bus transport and issued a new order, which covers almost all the points which have been raised in this particular Resolution, and which would produce greater satisfaction and greater effect.

My hon. Friend Mr. Purushotham wanted the Government to raise the distance limit from fifteen miles to twenty-five miles in the case of new entrants. The limit of fifteen miles is nothing sacred nor the limit of twenty-five miles. According to the latest Government Order, the whole transport system has been divided into three groups. One group consists of routes covering a distance of fifteen miles, another group from 15 to 75 miles and the third group from 75

13th September 1958] [Sri V. Ramaiah]

to 250 miles. When it was decided to have these three groups, I was only thinking of the passengers. To-day as it is, no passenger can get a seat in any bus in the mofussil for a distance of fifteen or twenty miles. As the demand from passengers has been going on increasing, even if I put in more buses, it would not be of much help. The person who wants to travel up to a distance of twenty or thirty miles will normally have to buy a ticket for a longer distance. Therefore, we thought that we could run a shuttle service to clear away as many people as possible from the towns as soon as their work was over. In order to help long distance passengers, I have decided to introduce Express buses. If I leave it to the normal service as such with its present number of buses and the timings and all that, it will more and more irritate the passenger and delay his work. But the Express buses will cover a long distance in a short time with lesser number of stops. This Express service is becoming very popular and it will continue to grow more popular.

With regard to long distance express routes, I feel that pure efficiency should be the criterion for deciding who should be the long distance operator and I cannot take a risk in respect of this matter. I cannot put rickety buses on the road and ask the passengers to get down in the middle of the journey.

Regarding the build-up of viable units, in the face of the demand for an increase in the number of buses, I feel that leaving the middle routes as such, small operators can come up without much difficulty in the course of the next few years. So, as it is, we are keeping a close watch on the progress of the transport service and we are giving a fair chance to the new entrants to come in, take their turn as bus operators and thus help the industry. I know that the industry is thriving to-day and I do not want to give the benefit to those who come in during the boom period alone and then run away when it is in some sort of static position because I am more interested in the industry growing and thriving. It is with that object in view that I limited the coming in of new entrants. There are also really efficient people to-day with resources, who have not been given a chance to enter the field. There are also a number of institutions having very efficient workshop facilities and experience. It is only with a view to affording an opportunity to those people, the co-operative institutions and many other categories of persons that we have given this chance. I am sure the present Government Order will go to the help of everybody and I do not feel there is any necessity to accept this Resolution now. The Resolution as drafted by the hon. Member will not help the man whom he has in view. On the other hand, the Resolution, if passed, will put those people whom the hon. Member wants to help, in more difficulties or, if I may use a strong term, will kill them.

3-50 p.m.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Mr. Chairman, Sir, apart from nationalization, all the observations that have been made here are beside the point and after all, we are trying to help new

[Sri K. M. Ramasamy Gounder] [13th September 1958

entrants to come in. The idea in bringing forward this Resolution is to see that there is no monopoly and that new entrants are encouraged as much as possible. I have personal knowledge of this affair. New entrants, according to the present Government Order, that is, G.O. No. 1298 . . .

THE HON. SRI V. RAMAIAH : That is not the present Government Order. The present Government Order will meet all your needs much more than what is contemplated in the Resolution.

* SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : With that assurance, I have no objection to withdraw the Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Sri Ramasamy Gounder, are you withdrawing the Resolution?

* SRI K. M. RAMASWAMY GOUNDER : Since the Hon. Minister has given an assurance, I withdraw the Resolution.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

(2) CLASSIFICATION OF ALL THE MUSLIMS AS BACKWARD.

* SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I move the Resolution standing in my name, namely—

"This Council recommends to the Government to abolish the classification of some Muslims whose mother tongue is Urdu as forward and classify all the Muslims irrespective of whether their mother tongue is Urdu or not as backward."

There is not much of controversy in this matter except for the historical background and I would state it as briefly as possible. Formerly, the Muslim community as a whole was taken to be backward for the purpose of grant of concessions in the educational field and also for the purpose of appointments in the Government service. time there was—I think in the 1920's—when the policy of the Government was to appoint two Muslims out of every twelve appointments that were made. That was really responsible, to some extent, for a good number of Muslims getting into Government service although the proportion was not fixed on the population basis. Apart from that, the Muslims being very backward in the field of education, some educational facilities and concessions were given to them and these were enjoyed by the community for a period of more than two decades. But a change came about in the year 1948 or so when Sri Omandur Ramaswami Reddiar was the Chief Minister, which reduced the number from two out of twelve to one out of twelve. That also went on for a period of four or five years. But with the change in the Constitution, it was thought and rightly thought that classification on the basis of community should go and that the question of appointment of persons based on religion, language or community should be decided on a planned basis. Then the Government divided the communities into backward communities

and forward communities. Then difficulty arose at that time as far as the Muslims were concerned. I am confining my remarks to the Muslims. All the Muslims from Malabar known as 'Mappillas' were considered backward. The 'Lubbai' section in Tamil Nad whose mother tongue is Tamil was considered backward. But the Muslims in Andhra and those in the City whose mother tongue was Urdu were considered forward. I think, if I remember aright, that we made a representation to this Government that it would be in the fitness of things to classify all the Muslims as 'backward' so that they might have all the facilities and educational concessions. In fact, Sir, it should not be taken that I am trying to deprive those who are already enjoying the concessions, of the facilities. I know, Sir, particularly as I had the honour of representing an Andhra constituency in the Legislative Assembly, that the Muslims whose mother tongue was Urdu were socially, economically and politically very backward. Therefore, that classification that those Muslims whose mother tongue was Urdu would be considered forward, was wrong. But the Government's decision was there and it was put into effect in spite of our agitation. Immediately the partition came and we were not bothered with the problem of Andhra, and of the remaining Muslims, whereas 80 to 85 per cent were classified as backward, only 10 to 20 per cent were considered 'forward.' Even then we made a representation but to no effect. Again, the partition came and Malabar seceded from us. In the case of the remaining Muslims, those whose mother tongue is Tamil are considered backward and the remaining about four or five lakhs of Muslims whose mother tongue is Urdu and who are mostly in the City of Madras, North Arcot and Tiruchirappalli are considered forward. The result is that the little facilities we would get in the field of education or in the matter of appointments to Government service, as you are quite aware, Sir, are denied to us. My resolution only submits to the Government to include those Muslims who are classified as 'forward' in the category of 'backward' people so that they may have the little concessions. If you make a comparative study of their conditions, you will know that there are certain Muslims whose mother tongue is Urdu but who are socially or economically backward. I may say, Sir, without meaning any offence, that Dr. Mahomed Usman, whom hon. Members in this House and others outside know fully well, though his mother tongue is Urdu, is considered 'backward'. (Laughter.)

Sir, when I am talking on the subject, the Hon. the Leader of the other House, our esteemed Finance Minister, has stated that the time has come for the Government to reconsider the whole question of classification of communities as 'backward' and 'forward.' He has expressed the view that the time has come when 'backwardness' and 'forwardness' should not be assessed purely on the basis of religion, caste or community but on the basis of the actual economic conditions of the various communities. If this is done, I have no objection. In fact, I would very much welcome it. But till that is decided, I think that these few persons who are now regarded as 'forward' should be helped. That is why I have

[Sri Mohamed Raza Khan] [13th September 1958

brought forward this Resolution. As you are quite well aware, Sir, the Muslims who are considered forward have also certain difficulties in the matter of selection of candidates for admission to schools or professional colleges or even in the matter of appointment to Services. I, therefore, commend my Resolution for the acceptance of the House.

4 p.m. SRI K. M. RAMASAMY GOUNDER : Sir, I second the Resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Resolution moved—

"This Council recommends to the Government to abolish the classification of some Muslims whose mother tongue is Urdu as forward and classify all the Muslims irrespective of whether their mother tongue is Urdu or not as backward."

The Resolution is now before the House for discussion.

* SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Resolution is really a very important one. As a matter of fact, I have always been opposed to any kind of distinction—backward or forward—being recognized among people. Suppose a hundred boys, who are qualified, apply for seats in the engineering college. I feel that all the one hundred boys must get admission in the engineering college irrespective of the fact whether they belong to one community or another But, unfortunately, the Government are not in a position to provide seats for all students. Perhaps, it will take a very long time for Government to assure admission to all those who apply. The same difficulty is experienced in the case of admission to medical colleges. It is a crime on the part of Government to say 'No' to a student who seeks admission to the medical college or the engineering college. I am trying to put things very plainly. But it is not possible in the present circumstances for the Government to give admission to all the students that apply. So, they have adopted some rough and ready method of selection. As far as certain communities are concerned, they give a certain number of seats on a certain basis.

Now the point is, as the hon. Member Mr. Raza Khan put it, that the Muslim community, whose mother tongue is Tamil, is, from the financial point of view, a really forward community. There is no doubt about that. As regards educational matters, they cannot stand comparison with any member of any other community which is characterized as forward. This is one point which we have to take note of. As far as school fee concession is concerned, let this be the guide, namely, whoever is capable of paying his school fee, let him pay, and whoever cannot pay, should not be asked to pay. Let the concession be given on the basis of one being poor. If a community is really backward from the point of view of education, should we not show that community some kind of concession? If the Government should come forward and say, 'You need not be

13th September 1958] [Sri A. M. Allapichai]

worried; we are going to have ten engineering colleges in the place of one; any number of boys will be admitted ', then there is no question of forwardness or backwardness, because everybody will then get admission. But the Government are not able to say sc now. They cannot say so. That being the case, should there not be some kind of arrangement to help educationally backward boys? If a community is really intellectually backward, should it not have some kind of safeguard? It is just like giving treatment in the hospital to a sick person. I think it is the imperative duty of the Government to see in course of time that all those who apply for admission to the professional colleges do get admission. So long as they are not able to give admission to all those who apply, there must be some arrangement for giving admission. If by bringing the Urdu-speaking Muslim people under the category of ' backward community ', any useful purpose will be served, I say " All right, do it ". But I will make this one suggestion, that is, " Make this Lubbai community ' more backward ' ". By bringing the Urdu-speaking Muslims under the category of ' backward community ', they may get some concessions. I do not stand against this. The only thing I would say is, " Make the Lubbai community ' more backward '." (Sri L. S. Karayalar : Most backward.) Give the Lubbai community some concessions.

Ours is a Welfare State. A child, after passing all the necessary examinations with distinction, goes to the college with the best of hopes and ambitions to seek admission. But he is told ' No.' I think this is a most heart-rending thing. I want to say that to cover up the incapacity of the Government to provide admission for all students, they have adopted this method of ' backwardness ' and ' forwardness.' We want to establish in India a classless and casteless society. But this question of ' forwardness ' and ' backwordness ' will only perpetuate caste in this country. So long as the Government are not able to provide seats in the professional colleges for all, there must be some arrangement by which selections could be made. The proposition put forward by the hon. Member Sri Mohamed Raza Khan is a reasonable one. There is nothing wrong about it. (Sri V. V. Ramaswami : Modest.) The only difficulty is this. We must see comparatively how it will work.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the assumption in the Resolution tabled by the hon. Member Sri Raza Khan appears to be that classification of backward communities is based on language. On the contrary, classification is made on the basis of educational, economic and social backwardness. Before any community is classified as a backward community, the District Collector, the Director of Public Instruction, and the Director of Harijan Welfare go into the question and make enquiries whether a community is economically backward, socially backward, and so on. So, it is not as if all the Urdu-speaking people have been classified as forward. If they have been classified as forward, it is not on the basis of language. But on the basis of their economic and social backwardness or forwardness, as the case may be, they

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [13th September 1958

are classified as backward or forward. Even when Lubbai and Mappilla communities have been classified as backward communities, it is not on the basis of language. Really it is on the basis of their social and economic backwardness, educational backwardness, and so on. Anyway, as the hon. Member Sri Raza Khan himself has said, the matter has ceased to be of any great importance. The Government of Madras have now a proposal for the
4-10 p.m. grant of educational concessions not on the basis of caste, creed, or religion, but on the basis of economic position and status in life, the ability to pay the school fee, and so on. So, this question is no longer of any particular importance. Very soon, a decision would be taken and then, there would be no need to classify the communities on the basis of social and educational backwardness and they will be classified on the basis of their income so that regardless of the community to which a person belongs, all poor students may get the educational concessions. I trust this will satisfy my esteemed Friend Mr. Raza Khan and he will withdraw his Resolution.

Sri MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, I am really thankful to my esteemed Friend Sri A. M. Allapichai for the support which he has given me. He himself knows the difficulties. I hope the Hon. the Leader of the House also knows the difficulties of the people. Sir, I do not like to enter into a debate with the Hon. the Leader of the House that the classification is based purely on language. But, I only wish to say that, as far as I know, it is based on language and that it is actually working on that principle.

In the City of Madras, in certain parts where the Muslims are predominant, the majority of them are working in beedi companies. As the Hon. the Minister for Labour himself is aware, these workers are paid wages at the rate of Re. 1-4-0 per day. The Hon. Minister himself is interested in seeing that these poor people get increased wages and better conditions of work. For all practical purposes, these poor people are classified as forward community people. So, they do not get any concessions. It is only in this context that I have brought forward this Resolution. However, as the Hon. the Leader of the House has said that the Government of Madras are going to bring forward or rather going to enunciate a wholesome principle by which all poor people regardless of the community to which they belong or the language which they speak will be given concessions, I have great pleasure in withdrawing the Resolution which I have moved.

One more thing I wish to state in this connection. At the time of selection to professional colleges and even at the time of applying for some of the Governmental posts, there is a tendency among some people to get false certificates to the effect that the person concerned belongs to a particular community, which is recognized as a backward community. I am not saying this only with reference to the Muslims. This happens in all cases and people get such false certificates. Thus, even at the beginning of their career,

13th September 1958] [Sri Mohamed Raza Khan]

the poor students have a tendency to get such false certificates. This is, of course, most undesirable. With these observations, I withdraw my Resolution, with the leave of the House.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have to make an announcement to the House as well as the Press. Short Notice Question No. 20-A has been postponed to the 17th instant. The papers laid on the table in connection therewith should not be published or referred to, till it is answered on the floor of the House.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, I am sorry I am making too many suggestions. May I request that the question may be taken up on the 18th instead of the 17th?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I cannot decide it myself.

(3) OPENING OF A NEW RAILWAY ROUTE.

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : அவைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, நான் எனது பேரில் இருக்கும் கீழ்க்கண்ட தீர்மானத்தைப் பிரேரேபணை செய்கிறேன்:

"This Council recommends to the Government to urge upon the Central Government to take immediate steps to open a new railway route to connect Manamadurai and Maniyachi via Mudukulathur taluk."

The Resolution was duly seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Resolution moved—

"This Council recommends to the Government to urge upon the Central Government to take immediate steps to open a new railway route to connect Manamadurai and Maniyachi via Mudukulathur taluk."

*SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : தலைவர் அவர்களே, ராமநாதபுரம் மாவட்டத்தில், முதுகுளத்தூர் பிரதேசமும், திருநெல்வேலி ஜில்லாவை யொட்டியிருக்கிற கிழக்குப் பிரதேசங்களுட மிகவும் பிற்பட்ட பிரதேசங்களாகயிருக்கின்றன. அங்கு வாழும் மக்கள் ஒரு கிராமத்திலிருந்து இன்னொரு கிராமத்திற்குப் போகவேண்டுமென்றால், தங்களுக்குள் ஒரு தொடர்பு வைத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்றால், நல்ல சாலைகள் இன்னும் அமைக்கப்படவில்லை. மேலும், இவைகளுக்கிடையில் பல சிற்றாறுகளும், ஓடைகளும் இருப்பதால், வருடத்தில் பெரும்பாலும் அவைகள் மழையால் சூழப்பட்டுத் தொடர்பே இல்லாமல் போய்விடுகிறது. ஆகவே, இவ்விரு மாவட்டங்களையும் இணைப்பதற்கு, குறிப்பாக நான் சொன்ன இந்த இரண்டு பிற்பட்ட பிரதேசங்களையும் இணைப்பதற்கு, ஒரு ரெயில் பாதை அமைக்கப்பட்டால், அங்குள்ள மக்கள் எளிதில் முக்கிய நகரங்களுக்குப் போய் வரவும் மற்ற நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவும் தற்கால நவீன நாகரிக முறையைத் தெரிந்துகொள்ளவும் ஏதுவாயிருக்கும். அப்பொழுதுதான் அங்குள்ள மக்களின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரமும் உயர்ந்து, அவாகள் நல்ல நாகரிக மனிதர்களாக வாழ முடியும். இந்த சாதனத்தைக் கட்டாயமாக ஏற்படுத்திக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று அங்குள்ள மக்கள் வெகு காலமாகவே அரசாங்கத்தினிடம் முறையிட்டு வருகிறார்கள். ராமநாதபுரம் மாவட்டத்தில் உள்ளதும், திருநெல்வேலி, தூத்துக்குடியில் உள்ளதுமான பல பொறுப்

[Sri V. V. Ramaswami] [13th September 1958

புள்ள ஸ்தாபனங்களும், வியாபார சங்கங்களும் ரெயில்வே பாதை கட்டாயம் போட்டப்படவேண்டுமென்று அரசியலாரிடம் பன்முறை கூறிவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். மானாமதுரைக்கும் மணியாச்சிக்கும் இடையே இருக்கும் தூரம் 69 மைல்தான் என்று சர்வே எடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. 1927-ல் ரெயில்வே நிர்வாகத்தால், ட்ராபிக் சர்வே எடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதில் ஏற்படும் செலவினத்திற்கு என்ன வருவாய் ஏற்படக்கூடும் என்று ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்கும்போது, அதிகமாக ஏற்படாது என்று அவர்கள் நினைத்தபோதிலும், மக்களுக்கு அதனால் ஏற்படும் பலன்களைப் பார்க்கும்போது, கட்டாயம் அதைச் செய்து கொடுத்துத் தான் ஆகவேண்டுமென்று அப்பொழுதிருந்த சென்னை அரசாங்கமும் வற்புறுத்தி வந்தது. மதுரையிலிருந்து போடிநாயக்கனூருக்குப் புதிய ரெயில்வே பாதை போட்டது அங்குள்ள கள்ளர் பகுதி மக்களை இப்பொழுது நல்ல வளமுள்ளவர்களாக ஆக்கியிருக்கிறது. அதுபோன்று இந்தப் பாதையையும் போட்டுக் கொடுத்தால், நாம் அங்குள்ள மக்களுக்கு நல்ல உதவி செய்தவர்களாவோம்.

1933-ல் ஏற்பட்ட ரெயில்வே என்கொயரி போர்டு இதைப்பற்றி ஆலோசித்து ஒரு அறிக்கையை அரசாங்கத்திற்குச் சமர்ப்பித்தது. அதில், இந்தத் திட்டத்தை நிதி நிலைமை சரியாக இருக்கும்போது எடுத்துக் கொள்ளலாம் என்று சொல்லியிருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறது. சென்னை அரசாங்கம் மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தை மேலும் வற்புறுத்தியதின் காரணத்தினால் 1934 மே 7-ம் தேதி சென்னை அரசாங்கத்திற்கு ரெயில்வே போர்டு ஒரு பதில் எழுதியிருக்கிறது. அதாவது, சமீபத்திலே அதை எடுக்க லாயக்கில்லை என்று தெரிவிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இருந்தபோதிலும் ரெயில்வே நிர்வாக அதிகாரிகள், ரெயில்வே இலாகாக்காரர்கள், இதைப்பற்றி ஆலோசித்து மறுமுறையும் ஒரு சர்வே எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கருத்துத் தெரிவித்திருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறது.

மத்திய அரசாங்கத் துணை அமைச்சர் ஸ்ரீ அளகேசன் அவர்கள் விருதுநகருக்கு வந்திருந்தபோது இந்த ரெயில்வே பாதையின் முக்கியத்துவத்தைப்பற்றி எடுத்துச் சொன்னோம். அருப்புக்கோட்டையில் உள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களும், விருதுநகர் வியாபாரிகளும் இதைப்பற்றி எடுத்துச் சொன்னார்கள். இப்பொழுது விருதுநகரிலிருந்து, அருப்புக் கோட்டை மூலம் கமுதி வழியாக மானாமதுரைக்கு ரெயில் பாதை போடத் திட்டமிருக்கிறது. அதைப்பற்றி ஆலோசிக்கப்படும் என்று சொன்னார்கள். அடுத்தாற்போல் ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டத்தில் இது சேர்க்கப்படும் என்றும் சொல்லப்பட்டது.

அமைச்சர் கனம் ஸ்ரீ பக்தவத்ஸலம் அவர்கள் விருதுநகருக்கு வந்திருந்தபோதும், நேரிலும், விருதுநகரிலிருந்து அருப்புக்கோட்டை வழி மானாமதுரைக்கு ரெயில் பாதை போடவேண்டுமென்று அடிக்கடி சொல்லியிருக்கிறோம். அவர்கள், சமயம் கிடைக்கும்போதெல்லாம் மத்திய சர்க்காரிடம் வற்புறுத்துகிறோம் என்று சொல்லி ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டத்தில் சேர்த்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார்கள். " ப்ரையாரிட்டீஸ் எந்த வழியில் வருகிறது என்று தெரியவில்லை. ஆயினும் அதன் முக்கியத்துவத்தைப்பற்றி எடுத்துச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறோம் " என்றும் சொன்னார்கள். மேலும் அத்துடன் மானாமதுரையிலிருந்து முதுகுளத்தூர் வழியாக மணியாச்சிக்கும் போகும்படியான ஒரு ரெயில் பாதை அமைத்தால் நான் குறிப்பிட்ட இரண்டு மாவட்டங்களிலுமுள்ள பிற்பட்ட பகுதிகளுக்கு நாம் உதவி செய்வதோடு, அங்குள்ள மக்களுக்கும் நாம் மிகவும் உதவி செய்தவர்களாவோம். இதற்கு இரண்டு பாதைகளும் போடப்பட்டால், அங்குள்ள மக்களுக்கு நவீன நாகரீக வாழ்க்கை நடத்துவதற்கு வழி செய்து கொடுத்தவர்களாவோம். இப்பொழுது மத்திய அரசாங்கத் துணை அமைச்சராக இருக்கும் ஸ்ரீ ராமசுவாமியவர்கள் விருதுநகர், அருப்புக்கோட்டைக்கு வந்தபோதும் இதுபற்றி வற்புறுத்தப்பட்டது. அதற்கு அவர்கள், " இதன் முக்கியத்துவத்தை அறிந்திருக்கிறேன், இதற்கு இரும்புத் தளவாடங்கள் வேண்டியிருக்கின்றன, நிலைமை சரியாகும்போது அதைப்பற்றிக் கவனிக்கலாம் ", என்று சொன்னார்கள்.

13th September 1958] [Sri V. V. Ramaswami]

"வோர்ள்ட் பாங்க்" இல் இருந்து ரெயில்வே விஸ்தரிப்புக்காக ஏதோ நம் நாட்டிற்குக் கடன் கொடுக்கப்போவதாக இன்று பத்திரிகைகளில் பார்த்தேன். முன்னால் செலுத்தவேண்டிய கடனுக்காக அது இருந்தாலும் இருக்கலாம். இருந்தாலும் இந்த முக்கியமான ரெயில்வே பாதையை மனதில் கொண்டு நமது அரசியலார், அதற்கு ஆவன செய்து மத்திய அரசாங்கத்தினிடம் எடுத்துச் சொல்லி, அப்பகுதியில் உள்ள மக்களுக்கு ஆக்கம் தேடித்தருவார்கள், தரவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இத் தீர்மானத்தை அங்கீகரிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

* THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Mr. Chairman, Government fully agree that railway facilities should be provided to cover the unserved regions in the Ramanathapuram district, particularly the Mudukulathur and Aruppukottai areas. At a Ministerial Conference convened by the Railway Ministry last year, I, on behalf of the Government, did urge the highest priority for the following six lines, although we had previously recommended as many as twelve important railway lines to be taken up :— 4-20 p.m.

1. Salem-Bangalore line.
2. Theni-Gudalur line.
3. Manamadurai-Virudunagar (via Aruppukottai) line.
4. Chinnasalem-Chingleput line.
5. Salem-Karur line.
6. Tirunelveli-Cape Comorin line.

We formulated these proposals after consulting the railway authorities and after going into the technical aspects of the question and also after taking into account the feasibility of these schemes being taken up for execution at the earliest possible time. Further this Government have examined again the question of taking up railway lines which would fulfil our immediate needs. But we are told that so far as the Second Five-Year Plan is concerned, there is no possibility of adding any new railway line over and above what the Planning Commission has agreed to. But it is our idea to urge on the Government of India to take up some of these lines at least under the Third Five-Year Plan. We are proposing to inform the Government of India again that the Virudunagar-Aruppukottai-Manamadurai to Kilakarai line must be given the highest priority as it covers a major portion of really difficult and inaccessible area We have been advised that it would be practicable to split up these proposals into two or three rather than as is suggested in the Resolution. We shall, therefore, urge on the Government of India to accord the highest priority to this—Virudunagar-Manamadurai-Aruppukottai to Kilakarai line. We also propose to urge on the Government of India to open another line connecting both Manamadurai and Tuticorin and to give this scheme also the highest priority. In the circumstances, I would request the hon. Member not to press his Resolution.

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI : கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்கள் சொல்லிய விவரங்களிலிருந்து எனது நோக்கம் ஈடேறும் என்று கருதுவதால் என்னுடைய தீர்மானத்தை வாபஸ் வாங்கிக்கொள்கிறேன்.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

(4) REMOVAL OF DISPARITY IN SCALES OF PAY OF HIGHER GRADE TEACHERS IN VARIOUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Sir, I move—

"This Council recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among the Higher Grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed."

I may tell hon. Members that this Resolution is for the removal of disparity by upgrading. Now, hon. Members may well remember that some three years ago—in 1955—I had occasion to bring before this hon. House a Resolution for the removal of disparity in the scales of pay for various kinds and grades of teachers serving in various institutions and under different agencies in this State. An assurance was given on that occasion that the disparity would be removed and I withdrew my Resolution. But provision was made in the Budget for only one category of teachers, viz., secondary grade teachers, and disparity as among the secondary grade teachers serving in the various schools under different agencies was removed. But suddenly a few months back, a new order was issued, perhaps on account of the huge cost involved, stating that secondary grade teachers who newly entered service and who taught only classes 1 to 5 in elementary schools should be paid a lower scale of pay. So, somehow or other, they have brought in the disparity again.

Now, this Resolution, hon. Members may note, is brought in on behalf of the teachers called higher grade teachers. Higher grade teachers are teachers who have qualified themselves by passing the E.S.L.C. (Eighth Standard Public Examination) or who have failed in the S.S.L.C. course or passed some Form between the III and the V Forms and have undergone teacher training for full two years in institutions approved by the Director of Public Instruction. So, besides their general qualification, all of them have had teacher's training for two years. These teachers number about 75,000 to-day in our so-called shrunken State. After the separation of Kerala and Kanara, there are 75,000 teachers called higher grade teachers and they come under five categories, which can be more appropriately called five different castes. What are these castes? They are, Government higher grade teachers, district board higher grade teachers, municipal higher grade teachers, panchayat higher grade teachers and private or aided school higher grade teachers. So, these 75,000 teachers are treated by a Government which claims to be secular, as belonging to five different castes. It is more than eleven years since we got Swaraj and nobody knows the reason why the Government keep them under these five categories. We have no quarrel with the Government if they keep them under five denominations or categories or castes, but there is a lot of difference in pay on account of such treatment.

Sir, this agency system crept in in the days of the Britisher and there is no reason why a national Government should perpetuate this system. Perhaps it is financially advantageous to the Government of the day. The Government teacher gets the highest salary.

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

The municipal and the district board teachers get a little lower salary. The private or the aided school teacher gets the lowest salary. The panchayat school teacher cannot be classified under any of these for the reason, as I have submitted on the sacred floor of this House many times, that he is treated as Markandeya for all purposes—not in respect of life. His salary is not paid properly and he is never given any increment. I do not know why the Government have put all these schools under the control of panchayats.

(Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

A higher grade teacher under Government gets a scale of Rs. 30—1—50. The district board and the municipal higher grade teachers get the same Rs. 30 as starting salary, get the big increment of one rupee annually and go up to a maximum of Rs. 45 as against Rs. 50 which their brother Government teacher gets. The aided school teacher starts on Rs. 30, gets a beautiful increment of annas eight per year and stops with Rs. 33. His brother teacher in the Government school goes up to Rs. 50 and in the local board school goes up to Rs. 45. But this poor teacher has to stop at Rs. 33 only. 4–30
In six years, earning an increment at the rate of Re. 0–8–0 a year, p.m.
he reaches the maximum of Rs. 33. Sir, out of the 75,000 teachers coming under this category of higher grade teachers more than 50,000 belong to the aided schools. So, 50,000 families are starved by a national Government, which claims to rule this State in the name of the Father of the Nation and with the objective of driving poverty out of this land. These 50,000 teachers get Rs. 17 less than the teachers with the same qualification, serving in Government schools.

Sometimes, Sir, the argument has been advanced from the Treasury Bench on the sacred floor of this House that the teachers in Government schools ought to get a little more because they are liable to transfer from place to place. But are they transferred everyday? Is transfer a reason for increase in the salary by Rs. 17 per month? Will any elementary school teacher incur by a transfer such a large amount of expense calculated at the rate of Rs. 17 per month? Nobody can admit that. Even taking that argument for granted . . .

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : What is your point? Is it that the salary of teachers drawing Rs. 50 should be reduced to Rs. 33 or that the salary of those drawing Rs. 33 should be increased to Rs. 50?

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, that is why I have submitted, at the very outset, that this Resolution is for levelling up of the salaries and removal of disparities by upgrading. In fact, that was my first sentence after moving my Resolution, that the disparity in the scales of pay as among the higher grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed.

[Sri G. Krishnamoorthy] [13th September 1958

The aided school teacher gets only Rs. 33. Taking the argument of transfer, what about the teacher in the municipal elementary school? If at all he is transferred, he is transferred within the municipal limits and not out of the town. He goes up to Rs. 45 instead of Rs. 33 which his brother teacher in the aided institution gets. What about the district board teacher? He is tossed from one end to the other end of the district. But this district board teacher also gets only Rs. 45 as against Rs. 50 allowed to the teacher under Government management, who is liable to transfer once in two or three years. All people know that the district board teacher is transferred from one end of the district to another and that the reason of transfer does not count in his case. So, the argument that Government teachers are given a higher pay because they are liable to transfer cannot stand.

Let me impress upon all the hon. Members the fact that all the teachers have the same general qualifications prescribed by the Government. They have the same general educational qualification. They all have come out of the same training schools established by the Government. The boys they are handling are the same, namely, the Indian children. The syllabus prescribed by the Department of Public Instruction, Madras, and which they are handling is the same. The schools are inspected by the same Inspectors, the Government authorities. In spite of the oneness in these things, they are treated as different by the Government ruling under a Constitution which speaks of equality of opportunities, equal pay for equal work and opportunity for those who are handicapped. What reason is there for the Government to perpetuate these things? Is it a matter of finance? If it is a matter of finance, many projects could be stopped, at least the projects which are not connected with the production of food. It is not a question of finance. It is a question clearly of want of mercy on the part of the Government, want of will on the part of the Government. If the Government will not accept these, then there can be only one reason, that is, the Government will not understand this problem. But I cannot understand the argument that they cannot understand the miseries of the teachers.

I can go on cataloguing the miseries of these teachers. This starting salary of Rs. 30 which goes up to Rs. 33 is not even equal to Rs. 7–8–0 of the olden days with the present cost of living index at 400 points. The increment of half a rupee which is to be given to him if his service is unblemished and satisfactory not only to the managements but the parents also and the Deputy Inspector of Schools, is not even worth Re. 0–2–0 of the olden days. If the teacher who is the moulder of the nation, whom the Nation wants to produce individuals to protect the hard-won freedom is to be paid only Rs. 7–8–0 of the old type and Rs. 30 of the present type, is it proper on the part of the Government or on the part of the Nation? Can there be any party politics in this? Is not a teacher expected

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

to be above party politics? Are not all children to be treated alike by the teacher? Is there the question of Opposition or Treasury Bench in this matter? It is a matter pertaining to the whole Nation and the hon. Members of this House are interested in the welfare of the Nation. If at all there are parties, it is only to see that the welfare reaches the people a little quicker. So, hon. Members, wherever they may be seated, will be one with me in this House that the moulder of the Nation who is expected to produce individuals who will be mentally, physically and spiritually equipped for the hard task of preserving the freedom won hard by the Father of the Nation and in whose name this Government is ruling, should be contented and they should support the Resolution and see that the moulder of the Nation is paid at least a living wage.

Sir, we were waiting and waiting for salvation. The First Five Year Plan, we thought, would bring us some salvation. Not a pie was given to us under that Plan. The Second Five-Year Plan came afterwards. We thought that something would be given to us at least by way of a living wage. Under this Plan also nothing was given. We have been fighting for house-rent allowance, and removal of discrimination in the case of teachers of one particular category, namely, teachers in the aided institutions. Government in their various reports have accepted that the aided school teachers have done the most efficient work but in spite of that, they do not want to loosen the strings of their purse in favour of these teachers who are losing their all, sacrificing their all in the cause of the nation. Somehow or other, the Government think that because the teachers are subjected to a monthly meeting wherein the Deputy Inspector arrives and the teachers are subjected to his control at the meeting, they are servile people and won't get up. But if there is a person like Krishnamoorthy, naturally he feels that it is his duty, his social duty and considers it to be the greatest piece of social work to see that if the future citizens are to be handled properly and with full attention, those in charge of them get a living wage. It is my firm conviction that the first charge on the revenues of any civilized Government must be education. Though it is eleven years since we got Swaraj, this question of removal of disparity in scales of pay which may cost the Government not even a few lakhs of rupees has been there before the Government. Is it not the duty of the Government to come forward and say: 'Well, Krishnamoorthy, somehow or other due to our pre-occupations, we forgot to amend this. It is but proper that persons with the same qualifications, same general qualifications, technical qualifications, handling similar classes, handling the same syllabus and inspected by the same officer should be paid at least the same salary'?

I would request hon. Members to note that this Resolution does not aim at increasing the wages. It aims at only the removal of disparity; it aims at the removal of discriminatory treatment which is a great sore. I would like to submit that this disappointment

works hard and if teachers are discontented today, it is only on account of this differential, Cinderella treatment given to them. As an hon. Member has already spoken, even from the time of the late Rt. Hon. Sastry, it has been said that the teachers belonging to the Government schools are Government's children, that the teachers under local bodies are Government's step-children and that the teachers in private schools are nobody's children. That is the case even to-day after so many years and so many decades. Is
4-40 p.m. it not but proper on the part of the Government to say, 'Well, it is a slip on our part. On account of our pre-occupations we did not amend it. We accept your Resolution.'? It is, after all, to remove the discriminatory treatment. Can a Government professing to do their work in the name of the Father of the Nation allow this discrimination to go on? Can a Government working under the Constitution which speaks of equal pay for equal work and equality of opportunities to all say that because he is in a particular institution, though he has the same qualification, he must not get the same pay as others? Instances are not wanting when the Government pointed out to us at the time of deputations, 'Well, that is all the lot of the people. See the clerks in the Secretariat. See the clerks in the Ministerial Service. The former are placed better than the latter. So, it is a man's luck.' Sir, I would humbly submit to the Government that in the case of the teachers it is not the case. Even if he is an M.A., L.T. or a B.A., L.T., he has to draw the scale of Rs. 75—5—145 or Rs. 85—5—125—10—175. Beyond that, he cannot expect in his life even if he be a man of merits. But in the case of the clerical service, there is no end to promotion. If there is dearth of men during war, there will be chances of promotion. It may be their luck. But here, in the case of the teacher, no war and no peace can help him. He is fixed to a certain rate and this rate of Rs. 30—1—50 in the case of the Government school higher grade teacher should be applicable to all higher grade teachers. I put this one question to the Treasury Benches. 'Are these teachers in the aided schools not doing national work?' What work are they doing? They are educating the children. Whose children are they? They are the nation's children and children of the people in India. How is the Government run? The Government is run with funds. Who supply the funds? It is the people that supply the funds. So, the Government, if at all they give, give only people's money. For what purpose are they going to give it? For the removal of disparity. It is for the purpose of seeing that the teacher there gets at least the satisfaction, though not increased wages, that he gets a pay similar to the pay got by a friend of his in Government service. Can there be any difference between a Government school and an aided school so long as the Government recognize that it is a school recognized by the department, so long as the Government say that that school should be run on departmental lines and subject to departmental regulations and so long as they say that the school will get grant only if approved by their Deputy Inspector or the District Educational Officer? It is the lookout of the Government to satisfy the agent

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

The Government is the principal. The School Manager is the agent. Why should the poor teacher who gets into that school suffer simply on account of the denomination of the school and simply because it is called a private school run by an agent? Why should the teachers in the district board schools also suffer simply because they are called local self-Government schools? This removal of disparity is an urgent need. It has to be done in the name of justice and in the name of equity. It has to be done by the Government in order to guard themselves against the charge that they have been giving discriminatory treatment to the teachers.

After all, this is a question costing a few lakhs of rupees. Our Government are getting sixty crores of rupees a year. The Government may at once come forward and say, 'Well, Krishnamoorthy, you gave out so many figures, Rs. 30—½—33. What about the dearness allowance we pay? What about the Rs. 12 increase we paid recently?' Certainly, the teachers are getting the dearness allowance of Rs. 18 and the Rs. 12 recently sanctioned. But what did our Government do when giving that Rs. 12 enhanced dearness allowance? In the case of teachers in high schools it has been treated as dearness allowance, but in the case of elementary schools, it has been classified into two fashions, the first fashion being called additional special pay and the second being called dearness allowance. I do not know what made the Government do so. I do not know whether it was done in order to get a Central grant. Subject to correction, it may be the reason. Or, perhaps they thought that they would be giving additional six rupees as pay. But this additional pay does not come under 'Pay'. It is not to be taken into account by the Government authorities for purposes of increment, provident fund and pension. Though it is embellished in very liberal terms as 'special additional pay', it has not got the effect of even the last word 'pay'. The purpose of my Resolution is removal of disparity. This Resolution is not for grant of enhanced scale; it is not about the payment of Rs. 18 or Rs. 12 which has been paid to the Government teacher, local board teacher and aided school teacher also. But what about this disparity? It still continues. A Government school teacher gets a maximum of Rs. 50 plus Rs. 22 plus Rs. 12, but this man gets only Rs. 33 plus Rs. 18 or Rs. 19 plus Rs. 12. There is this disparity, disparity in the scale and disparity in the amount actually received by him. The difference of Rs. 17 is there, in spite of what the Government have claimed to have granted recently. I am not speaking about the question whether this amount will be sufficient for his livelihood. If I speak about that, it will be a tale of sorrow. The teacher will have a big family. This Rs. 33 has not got the purchasing power as much as Rs. 8 in olden days. He cannot buy food, clothes and books for his children. Even supposing education is free at all stages—it is not free at all stages; only recently it has been made free up to the S.S.L.C. stage—what about feeding and clothing of the children? How can the teacher sit in the class with shrunken eyes? How can he set a model to the pupils?

Is he there to be in a shrunken stage, without even a square meal? He has to do the task of moulding the future nation. Especially in independent India, I am really sorry that I have to plead the cause of 50,000 families to get a pittance of Rs. 17 by way of removal of disparity. This Rs. 17 is not equal to Rs. 4 of the past. So, I would request hon. Members to kindly consider this question, view this as an all-Party question, a national question, a question affecting the future generation, a question that is concerned with their own children who are considered as darlings of Bharata Bhoomi, and support me fully so that this discriminatory treatment which has somehow or other been allowed to persist all these eleven years since the dawn of freedom may not be allowed to continue but may be just put an end to by the Government.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Government of Madras recently sanctioned a sum of Rs. 12 to the teachers. But there is the disparity in the scales of pay between the Government teacher and the aided elementary school teacher. The Government who are very sympathetic towards the teachers should pay special attention to this matter of removing this disparity. We should guarantee equal pay for equal work. The difference is a pittance of only Rs. 17. So, the Government should specially consider this question and remove the disparity.

* SRI M. PATANJALI SASTRY : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Resolution of the hon. Member is a modest one. It only asks for removal of disparity in the scales of pay of the Government school teacher and the aided elementary school teacher. I have always wondered how an elementary school teacher getting a pay of Rs. 33 could carry on his work of moulding the future generation of citizens efficiently. He would have his own domestic troubles. He would have to meet the pestering demands of his wife and children. With what enthusiasm could he handle the little children in their formative years? It has always appeared to me to be a great task. But, somehow or other, in this country this state of affairs has gone on. I wish that it does not continue and that this disparity is removed soon. I give my wholehearted support to this Resolution.

4-50 p.m. * VIDWAN T. MUTHUKANNAPPAN : மேல் மன்றத் துணைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இப்பொழுது கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஸ்ரீ கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி பேசியதை யொட்டி நானும் கொஞ்சம் பேசுவதாக இருக்கிறேன். நான் ஒரு ஆசிரியர் குலத்திலே — ஆசிரியர் குடும்பத்திலே—பிறந்தவன். என்னுடைய சுற்றத் தார்களிலே அத்தனை பேரும் ஆசிரியர்கள். நான் ஒரு தொடக்க நிலைப் பள்ளியில் ஆசிரியராக 6, 7 ஆண்டுகள் பணியாற்றியிருக்கிறேன். அந்த நிலையிலே ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர்கள் படும் துன்பங்கள் எவ்வளவு, அவர்கள் படும் துயரங்கள் எவ்வளவு, என்பதை நான் நன்றாக அறிந்திருக்கிறேன். இந்த பாரத புண்ணிய பூமியிலே உயர்ந்த தமிழ் நாட்டிலே, யாராவது இன்றைக்கு மிக மிகத் துன்பத்தை அனுபவிக்கும் நிலையில், துயரை அனுபவிக்கும் நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்களென்றால், அவர்கள் ஆரம்பப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்கள்தான் என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்ள ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

13th September 1958]   [Vidwan T. Muthukannappan]

மேலும், ஆரம்பப் பள்ளி ஆசிரியருக்கு 30 ரூபாய் தொடக்கத்தில் சம்பளம். சாதாரணமாக 18-வது; 20-வது வயதில் இந்த ஆசிரியர் பணியை மேற்கொள்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் 55-வது, 60-வது வயது வரை வேலையில் இருக்கலாம். ஆக 42 ஆண்டுகள் பணி செய்த பிறகு, கடைசியாக 33 ரூபாய் சம்பளம் வாங்குகிறார் என்பதை நினைக்கும்போது, மிகவும் கேவலமாக இருக்கிறது. இந்த அவலநிலையை மறக்கமுடியாது, மறுக்க முடியாது, மறைக்க முடியாது. இத்தகைய கேவலமான நிலை தொடக்கப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு, ஆரம்பப்பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்றால், அது நமது நாட்டு ஆசிரியர்களுக்கே மாசு தேடுவதாக இருக்கிறது.

மேலும், மாணவர் உலகம் நன்றாக இல்லையென்று நினைக்கிறார்கள், சீர்கேடடைந்திருக்கிறது என்று நினைக்கிறார்கள், சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதற்கு மூல காரணம் என்ன என்பதை ஆராய்ந்தால் தெரியும். தொடக்க நிலைப் பள்ளி ஆசிரியர்களுக்கு உணவு, உடை, உறைவிட வசதிகள் சரியாக இல்லாத காரணத்தினால்தான், அவர்களிடத்தில் பயிலும் மாணவர்களும் சரியாக இல்லாமலிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு உண்ண நல்ல உணவில்லை, உடுக்க நல்ல உடையில்லை, இருக்க சரியான உறைவிடமில்லை. இவர்கள் இத்துடன் எப்படிப் போய் 40, 45 மாணவர்களுக்குச் சொல்லிக்கொடுப்பார்கள்? அவர்கள் நிலை அவலமான நிலையாக இருந்து வருகிறது.

அரசாங்கப் பள்ளிகளுக்கும், தனியார் பள்ளிகளுக்கும், ஜில்லா போர்டு பள்ளிகளுக்கும், வேறு வேறு படி இருப்பது நன்றாகயில்லை. ஒரே தரமாக இருப்பதே நல்லது, ஒரே முறையாக இருப்பது நல்லது, ஒரே நிலையாக இருப்பது நல்லது. ஒரு ஆசிரியர் உயர்ந்த தன்மையுடையவராக இருக்க வேண்டும், உயர்ந்த பண்புடையவராக இருக்கவேண்டும். மாதம் ஒன்றுக்கு 30 ரூபாய் சம்பளத்தை வாங்கிக்கொண்டு எப்படி அவர்கள் கண்ணியமாக இருக்க முடியும்? நல்ல உடைதான் உடுத்த முடியுமா? நல்ல பலவித புஷ்டியான உணவுதான் சாப்பிட முடியுமா? நல்லதன மாகக் குடும்பம் நடத்தவேண்டுமென்றால், முடியுமா? 45, 50 ரூபாய் சம்பளத்தில் எப்படி வாழ முடியும் என்பதை எண்ணிப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். இந்தமாதிரி நிலையோடு கூட, விபரீதமான வேற்றுமை, சம்பளத்தில் வேறுபாடுகள் இருக்கக்கூடாது. அதை அரசாங்கம் முக்கிய மாக நன்றாகச் சிந்தனை செய்து, சமத்துவமான சம்பளத்தை ஏற்படுத்த வேண்டுமென்று தாழ்மையோடு கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

***Dr. A. CHIDAMBARANATHAN:** கனம் துணைத் தலைவர் அவர்களே, இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைப்பற்றி நான் இரண்டு மூன்று சொற்கள் மட்டும் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். திருவாளர் ஜி. கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் இந்தத் தீர்மானச் செய்தியை வெகுவாக ஆராய்ந்து அலசி, வெகு ஆர்வத் துடன் எடுத்துக் கூறினார். அவர் எடுத்துக் காட்டியபடி, ஆரம்ப ஆசிரியர் களைப்பொறுத்த வரையில் மூன்று படி நிலைகள், 30—1—50, 30—1—45, 30—½—33, இருக்கின்றன. அவர்கள் ஒரே படிநிலையாக அமைத்துத் தாருங்கள் என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். ஆரம்பச் சம்பளத்தை 30 ரூபாயி லிருந்து 45 ஆக ஆக்குங்கள் என்று கேட்டிருந்தால் கூட, நல்லது. தற்காலிகமாகக் கிடைக்கக்கூடியதைக் கேட்கவேண்டாம் என்று அதனைத் தள்ளிப்போட்டுவிட்டு, படி நிலையை ஒன்றாக ஆக்குங்கள் என்று, இதை யாவது ஏற்றுக்கொண்டால், இப்பொழுது நல்லது என்று கேட்கிறார்கள். ஆரம்பச் சம்பளமாக உள்ள 30 ரூபாயை 45 ரூபாயென உயர்த்துவது என்றால், அதிகச் செலவு ஏற்படலாம் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு. ஆனால், ரூ. 30—1—50, ரூ. 30—1—45, ரூ. 30—1/2—33 என்பதை மாற்றி யமைத்து எல்லோரும் ரூ. 30—1—50 என்ற விதத்தில் சம்பளம் பெறுமாறு செய்வதால், அதிகச் செலவு ஏற்படாது என்ற நம்பிக்கையில் தான், திருவாளர் கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை இந்த விதத்தில் வற்புறுத்தியிருக்கிறார்கள் என்று நம்புகிறேன். இந்தத் தீர்மானம் மிகவும் ஆதரிக்கத் தக்க தீர்மானம். ஏனென்றால் இப்பொழுது பல ஆசிரியர்கள் ரூ. 45-இலேயே பல ஆண்டு காலமாகத் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறார்கள். பல

ஆசிரியர்கள் ரூ. 33-இலேயே தேங்கிக் கிடக்கிறார்கள் பல ஆண்டு காலமாக இப்போது அரசாங்கம் ரூ. 30—1—50 படி நிலையில் உயர்த்தும்போது என்ன செய்யுமென்றால், 33 ரூபாய் சம்பளம் வாங்கும் ஆசிரியருக்கு 34 ரூபாய்தான் கொடுக்கும் ; 30—1—45-இலே, ரூ. 45 சம்பளம் வாங்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கும் ஆசிரியர்கள் எவ்வளவோ பேர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு இப்போது அரசாங்கம் 46 ரூபாய்தான் கொடுக்கவேண்டி ஏற்படும். தேங்கிக் கிடக்கும் ஆசிரியர்கள் சம்பளத்தில் தனித்தனி 1 ரூபாய் தான் உயரப் போகிறது. ஒவ்வொரு ஆசிரியருடைய அடிப்படைச் சம்பளத்தையும் 45 ரூபாய் என்று ஆக்கினால் எவ்வளவு செலவாகுமோ, அந்த அளவு செலவாகாத ஒரு திட்டம் என்ற வகையிலே திருவாளர் கிருஷ்ணமூர்த்தி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த தீர்மானத்தை முழு மனத்தோடு ஆதரிக்கிறேன். இதற்குச் செலவு என்ன ஆகும் என்று அரசாங்கம் சிந்தித்து உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு அமருகிறேன்.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have had a most passionate appeal on behalf of teachers, from one who has represented their cause with considerable distinction in this House and outside. It has left an impression, at any rate in my mind, as if the condition of the teachers is worse and most deplorable and nothing in this country is worse than that. I am sure, hon. Members of this House will appreciate that the Government have been doing their very best to improve the lot of teachers in various small ways.

The hon. Member Sri Krishnamoorthy himself acknowledged that since November 1956, the allowances of the teachers have been enhanced to the extent of Rs. 12. We have also introduced a pension system for the teachers in the schools. Whatever is possible under the circumstances, the Government are endeavouring to do. Therefore, I would ask for a little patience on the part of the hon. Member Mr. Krishnamoorthy and others in this matter. If it were only a question of the teachers, certainly the Government would have no difficulty in meeting that particular demand. But we are aware that similar passionate appeals are made by the Non-Gazetted Officers, by the employees in Government industrial undertakings and by almost everybody in Government employment, and the result is that we have to face the problem of finding the requisite finance for meeting these demands. In this connection, the hon. Member Mr. Krishnamoorthy has suggested that we have to cut our developmental expenditure to such an extent as to enable us to pay increased salaries to the teachers. I do not know how the country would accept that alternative solution. In fact, the demand on the resources of the Government is so great from people who are far worse than the teachers, in the villages in the various parts of the country, who want industries to be established for them, roads to be constructed for them and hospitals to be built for them and who are equally passionate in their appeal to the Government, to see that this national Government of theirs do justice to them. Sir, I am only pointing out all these things to show that the Government have to balance all these considerations and that they are endeavouring their best to do justice by each one of those who make this demand on the Government. (Interruption.)

13th September 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

Everybody wants a living wage in this country. Unfortunately, many people do not know that the average *per capita* income of the people of this State is only Rs. 225. So, we have to balance the various demands and see that we do the best with the resources that are available. There is a limit to taxation. It is not as if we can go on increasing taxation to any length and it is not humanly possible in the present context of our economic position, completely to dissolve all the differences in pay scales existing in several sectors of our public undertakings as well as in public life. Sir, the House is also aware that a Committee of the Legislature 5 p.m. has been constituted to advise the Minister for Education on this question of elementary education. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the report of the Committee. On page 46 in paragraph 36, the Committee has said—

" It will be seen from the statement of provisional allocation of funds for the Second Five-Year Plan period, that a sum of Rs. 322 lakhs is set apart to meet the cost of increase in the pay of school teachers. Out of this sum, Rs. 236 lakhs are intended for teachers employed in Elementary Schools, as well as for teachers of the same grades employed in Secondary Schools (in the primary and middle phases of School Education). The allocation is provisional pending settlement of the following questions :—

(i) To what extent Central Government grants would be forthcoming in order to meet this expenditure;

(ii) whether having regard to (i) and other needs of the Development and Reorganization programmes, the size of the allocation was correct; and

(iii) what is the amount of increase in recurring annual-cost-per-teacher which could be afforded, consistently with the decisions to be taken on the Elementary Education (Intensive Development) Scheme."

Therefore, I may say, Sir, that the matter is under the active consideration of the Government and that they are trying to see what best could be done to improve the lot of the teachers. I would, therefore, request the hon. Member to give some more time to the Government to formulate a scheme in the light of the recommendations of the Legislature Committee.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair.)

DR. V. K. JOHN : May I ask, Sir, what is the time required?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Perhaps it will be introduced in the next financial year 1959–60. We have also to decide how much we would get from the Central Government and how much this Government would have to provide for it. The hon. Member Sri G. Krishnamoorthy said that a uniform scale

of pay should be fixed. I may say that even the Legislature Committee has recommended that there is scope for difference in pay. The Committee has suggested as follows:—

"We recognise, however, the need for making one general exception to this rule, viz., that reasonable difference can be justified where it is related to liability for transfer over considerable distances from one school to another."

Therefore, I venture to submit, Sir, that it will not be possible to fix uniform scale of pay, as suggested by the hon. Member. In view of the recommendations of the Legislature Committee referred to above, I would request the hon. Mover of the Resolution to withdraw it bearing in mind that the matter is under the active consideration of the Government.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very, very sorry that the Hon. Minister has not replied to my point. My Resolution here is not for enhanced salaries as stated by him.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You want an uniform scale of pay. That means enhancement in pay.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: This particular Resolution is for removal of discriminatory treatment which ought to have been done away with voluntarily by a national Government. That is what is involved in this Resolution.

Now, with regard to the cut in developmental expenditure, I am fully for it and the Government are in a position to do it. The Government yet, I am sorry to say, have not considered education as a chief factor in a development plan. The authors of the First Five-Year Plan, the Second Five-Year Plan and the Third Five-Year Plan yet to come, have not recognized this. Unless education is considered a chief factor, the various targets in the various fields in the Five-Year Plans would not be achieved to the extent they are desired to be achieved. Education is an asset which may not be perceptible. It will not be available for demonstration for voting purposes, I say. But it is an asset that is carried on from brain to brain, from generation to generation, from person to person, and from birth to birth. Such a thing which is a cultural heritage of this ancient land where the late Gokhale lived and the late Balagangadhar lived and fought for freedom, has been neglected by a national Government. Even the Father of the Nation lived and fought for freedom and basic education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is going beyond the scope of the Resolution. He must confine himself to the terms of the Resolution.

* SRI G. KRISHNAMOORTHY: Education should be the main factor in any development scheme. I had often pleaded on the sacred floor of this House whether the allotment of Rs. 12 crores which was equal to 20 per cent of the total revenues spent by this Government every year on education, could not be reorganized so as to give the maximum benefit to the teachers. But

13th September 1958] [Sri G. Krishnamoorthy]

the Government have not paid any heed to my representation or have not accepted or even repudiated the representation. I have also often suggested that a fund called "Teachers' Maintenance Fund" should be started by the Government. Such a non-official resolution was brought at the time, if I remember aright, when Sri C. Rajagopalachariar was the Chief Minister. I do not know what the Government have done with regard to that. Things can be done, if the Government really will.

Even with regard to the allotment in the Second Five-Year Plan, the proposed allotment of Rs. 38 crores was reduced to Rs. 15 crores and it has been further reduced to about Rs. 12 crores. I would like to know what is allotted every year of the Five-Year Plan and whether it really goes to the teacher. I would like to take pride in repeating my remark that our Government have more faith in brick and mortar than in men and minds. You will find this in the First Five-Year Plan and also the Second Five-Year Plan.

Now, with regard to the recommendation of the Legislature Committee, the only benefit that has been conferred on the teachers of the high schools is that instead of 180 days, they have been asked to work 200 days without any extra pay.

I was very glad to learn from the Hon. Minister that a sum of Rs. 236 lakhs had been set apart to meet the cost of increase in the pay of the teachers employed in elementary schools. The Hon. Minister said that this was a provisional allotment. I would like to know details as to whether this would be allotted in 1959–60 or before the close of the Second Five-Year Plan period. I would humbly submit, as already stated by me, that this Resolution is in no way concerned with the enhancement of salaries claimed by all people who do not get a living wage or a proper wage. This Resolution, I repeat again, is for the removal of the discriminatory treatment as among teachers in aided schools and Government schools, with the same general qualifications and technical qualifications and inspected by the same inspecting authority. Should there be a discriminatory treatment by a national Government which stands for equality of opportunities and equal pay for equal work under the Constitution? This Resolution is nothing but a request to the Government to remove the disparity in the scales of pay of higher grade teachers and this would not cost much to the Government as pointed out by my esteemed colleague, Dr. Chidambaranathan. With regard to the new entrants also, the Government would not be incurring any extra expenditure because they are going to start with Rs. 30. Thus, this Resolution is in no way concerned with enhancement of salaries, but is only for the removal of the discriminatory treatment and if the Hon. Minister cannot convince me about the necessity for the disparity and persists in his view that this discriminatory treatment should be there, I can remark that this Government want to divide and rule as the Britisher did and that instead of the "white bureaucracy", we have now a "brown bureaucracy".

[13th September 1958

5-10 p.m. MR. CHAIRMAN : I now put the Resolution to the vote of the House. The question is—

" This Council recommends to the Government that the disparity in scales of pay as among the Higher Grade teachers in the various elementary schools under the various agencies in the State be removed ".

The Resolution was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and vote was taken.

(After the name of Sri M. Ethirajalu was called by the Secretary, Vidwan T. Muthukannappan entered the Chamber.)

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, the hon. Member Vidwan T. Muthukannappan came into the Chamber just now. His name should not be included in the counting.

(Vidwan T. Muthukannappan's name was not included in the counting.)

The House divided thus—

Ayes.

Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar.
,, V. K. John.
Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar.
,, V. V. Ramaswami.
Dr. A. Chidambaranathan.
Sri Mohamed Raza Khan.
,, L. S. Karayalar.
,, G. Krishnamoorthy.
Dr. A. Sreenivasan.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman.
Sri P. S. Krishnaswamy Ayyangar.
,, M. Ethirajalu.
,, A. Gajapathy Nayagar.
,, T. Purushotham.
,, A. M. Allapichai.
,, M. Seshachariar.
Dr. Mahomed Usman.
Srimathi Jothi Vencatachellum.
,, S. Manjubhashini.
Sri N. Annamalai Pillai.
Srimathi Mary C. Clubwala Jadhav.
Sri V. M. Surendram.

Neutral.

Nil.

Ayes—9. *Noes*—13. *Neutral*—Nil.

The Resolution was lost.

(5) CONSTITUTION OF A COMMITTEE FOR THE WELFARE OF WOMEN.

*SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, I move the Resolution standing in my name, namely :—

" This Council recommends to the Government that a Committee of lady Members of both Houses of the Legislature be constituted to enquire into and report on the social disabilities of women and the social welfare measures to be instituted in this behalf at State level ".

I feel, Sir, I need not dwell at length upon the merits of this Resolution. I am sure the hon. lady Members behind me will more eloquently put forward the plea for a Resolution of this kind. In

13th September 1958] [Sri T. Purushotham]

the days of foreign rule, the foreigners were afraid of introducing any social reforms, but now this is our Government, and we should take the responsibility for removing all social disabilities of women. (Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar: Are not men suffering from social disabilities?) I need not dwell on this point when the Constitution provides for social justice and equality in all directions—social, economic and political. All this could be achieved in a Welfare State, if we introduce the necessary reform in our social structure. I have particularly proposed that this Committee should consist of lady Members of both Houses, because it had been the common plea among men, whenever any social reform was proposed, that women were against it, and that the women in our houses were opposed to any progress in this direction. It is because I felt that such a blame should not be there and that women themselves should meet and decide what reforms should be introduced in our State, I have proposed that a committee consisting of lady Members of both Houses should meet, discuss and submit proposals to Government in what directions social reforms should be taken up. We note the other day a non-official Bill for the abolition of the dowry system was introduced in the other House.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR: By whom?

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: By a non-official member in the other House.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: Male or female?

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: By a male member. It is such measures that should receive the attention of the Government. Social Welfare Conferences have been held, and they have put forward concrete proposals for the consideration of the Government. They have put forward proposals for the removal of social disabilities of women and for social welfare measures generally.

SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAI: What are the disabilities from which women suffer to-day?

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: That is what I want the lady Members themselves to consider and put forward for the consideration of the Government. We are also having women's conferences, and those conferences have placed before the Government certain Resolutions which have not been considered so far. Of course, equality in the matter of property has been conceded by Government. This is a Central subject. Women have now come to realise their place in social progress. For instance, the other day my hon. Friend was referring to the need for family planning. Even here, I am glad to learn from friends who are in charge of this branch of work that married women under confinement nowadays offer themselves for necessary treatment. They also prevail upon their husbands to agree to the latest methods of treatment in regard to family planning. I am mentioning this because there

was some doubt expressed some time back whether the family planning scheme would be a success. I say that women are no longer a drag on society in our programmes for progress. They are ready to shoulder any responsibilities for the progress of society and the nation as a whole. That is why I have brought forward this Resolution so that the lady legislators of both Houses can meet, discuss, and submit concrete proposals to the Government.

With these words, I move this Resolution for the acceptance of the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition and the entire House. (Sri Mohamed Raza Khan: You yourself will withdraw the Resolution later on.)

Sri A. GAJAPATHY NAYAGAR: I second the Resolution, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved—

"This Council recommends to the Government that a Committee of lady Members of both Houses of the Legislature be constituted to enquire into and report on the social disabilities of women and the social welfare measures to be instituted in this behalf at State level".

The Resolution is before the House for discussion.

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI: அப்படி ஒரு கமிட்டி நியமிப்பதாக இருந்தால் ஸ்ரீ டி. புருஷோத்தம் அவர்களையும் ஒரு அங்கத்தினராகச் சேர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM: I am not a lady.

5-20 p.m. * Sri A. M. ALLAPICHAI: Mr. Chairman, I do not see how this Resolution is very necessary. As a matter of fact, wherever they may be—whether in India or England or America—ladies are generally conservative. There is no doubt about that. They are more conservative than men. As far as reforms for ladies are concerned—whatever the reform may be—it is the men that have to take the initiative. Take, for example, their right to stand for elections. Even without any effort on their part, the Indian women were able to achieve that right. For getting the same right, British women had to put up so many fights. My hon. Friend Sri Purushotham seems to think that women are under a very great disadvantage. Certainly not. I totally disagree with him in this respect. It is the lady that rules over the world. There is no doubt about that. (Laughter.) The mother rules over the son, the wife rules over the husband (laughter), the sister rules over the brother. It is going on in that fashion. Therefore, I do not understand how they are subordinated. No doubt, in the past, that is, in ancient days, when views held by people were different, it was a different matter altogether. Now, why should it be said that only ladies should be members of the proposed Committee?

13th September 1958]

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI : May I know whether the hon. the Deputy Chairman is giving his personal married experience? (Laughter.)

* Sri A. M. ALLAPICHAI : Yes, I am speaking from personal married experience. (Laughter.) What I wish to suggest is this. This Resolution is not at all important. Because, there is our Constitution, which lays down certain directive principles. If the ladies feel compelled to do some such thing, they are the best judges. I would like to know from the hon. Member Sri Purushotham whether he has taken the permission of the lady Members of the other House (laughter) for moving such a Resolution. Perhaps, they may themselves resent such a Resolution.

Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM : I may tell the hon. Member that I have informally consulted the lady Members of both the Houses.

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI : I want to know whether he has consulted Mrs. Purushotham. (Laughter.)

* Sri A. M. ALLAPICHAI : I think the best thing is to leave matters as they are. No doubt, wherever possible, representation is being given to them. Even the other day, on the floor of this House, when the District Development Councils Bill was being considered, we pleaded for representation for women. Like that, we would be appealing to the Government to nominate as many women as possible to the various bodies. We will always appeal to the Government to give representation to lady members and other minorities. So, I am not saying anything against the ladies. If we want them to function effectively, they request the help of men. Without men's help, it is not possible for them to function effectively. Therefore, no one need think that men are so cruel and horrible as not to help women. As a matter of fact, men will go to any length to help women. It is a fact that we are all doing that. (Laughter.) That being the case, why should our friend think otherwise? Now, he wants to throw the entire responsibility of looking after ladies on ladies themselves, as if men have nothing to do with them and the ladies can get on without the help of men. Nothing of that sort. The proposed committee will not serve the purpose for which it is proposed to be constituted. I am sure about it. Does my hon. Friend Mr. Purushotham mean to say that men do not know the disabilities from which the ladies suffer? It is not correct for him to think like that. We know their disabilities.

Srimathi S. MANJUBHASHINI : Not all men.

* Sri A. M. ALLAPICHAI : We know their disabilities.

Sri V. V. RAMASWAMI : பிள்ளை பெறுவதிலுள்ள சிரமம் அங்கத்தினருக்குத் தெரியுமா ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN : I think the House is getting very frivolous. (Laughter.)

* SRI A. M. ALLAPICHAI : Men know the disabilities of women. I think my hon. Friend Mr. Purushotham has got some prejudice and is doubtful that men may not help women. It is not correct. I feel that this Resolution is not at all necessary.

SRIMATHI MARY C. CLUBWALA JADHAV : Mr. Chairman, I thank the Mover of the Resolution. But, he has not consulted me at all. (Laughter.) I fully support the idea that there should be Women's Committees consisting of lady Members of the Legislature. There are many measures which do not affect women and children. It is true that men give us full support in various matters. But, there are certain matters which affect the ladies only and the ladies must have their own representatives to attend to such matters. No doubt, the women of India have got so many rights without much effort, in contrast to British women and American women and they are an envy to others. Still, there are many disabilities from which the women are suffering. So, I do feel that we should have our committee to deal with such matters and help the women. I support the Resolution so ably moved by the hon. Member Mr. T. Purushotham. I am very glad that a gentleman-Member has introduced this Resolution and I once again wholeheartedly support it.

* SRIMATHI S. MANJUBHASHINI : Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Resolution moved by the hon. Member Sri Purushotham. I very much appreciate the sentiments expressed by him and also Mrs. Jadhav. The hon. Deputy Chairman probably thought that this Resolution was a sort of complaint against men as such. That is not so. The disabilities experienced by women can only be visualised and realised by women. For the support of this argument of mine, I would like to quote a very great social worker, Mrs. Durgabai Deshmukh. She has made several statements in this connection. The Central Government have recently formed a National Committee on Women's Education. When she was here recently, she observed that wherever she went, she noticed the very low percentage in respect of women's education and that there were very many disabilities from which they were suffering. Actually, there is no harm in passing a Resolution of this kind. This committee will be able to bring to light the many problems facing women. I strongly support the Resolution. Of course, the Government have given us some representation in the Legislature. If any class or if any section of humanity can be classed as backward, it is women that qualify for it. There is no doubt about it. I am very glad that my hon. Friend Sri T. Purushotham has moved this resolution. I hope the Government will give its earnest consideration to it and accept it.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Chairman, after hearing the eloquent speech of my esteemed Friend T. Purushotham who said that the days of chivalry were over, I feel that he could have easily taken on the role of the Knight of the Round Table of King Arthur. But, in his enthusiasm, he has overlooked a few facts. There are already committees to look after the welfare of

13th September 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

women in the State. We have the State Social Welfare Advisory Board and also the State Advisory Committee for Women's Welfare. Members of the Legislature are also members of these committees and certainly they are looking into all the disabilities encountered by women. Surely, they are doing excellent work in relation to disabilities like lack of educational and medical facilities, meagre family income, social disabilities, desertion by husband, destitution and so on. While there is a case for an informal committee among women Members of the Legislature to discuss such things and formulate their views on social and other problems, a committee at State level is certainly not called for. It will only lead to duplication of work and detract from the useful work which is being done by the other two committees. Therefore, the Government, while commending the principle underlying the Resolution, would ask the lady Members to see that the Resolution is resisted. 5-30 p.m.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : I wish to assure the Hon. the Leader of the House that my main purpose in bringing forward this Resolution was . . .

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : To withdraw. (Laughter.)

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : To have a sort of a forum for women Members to express their views with regard to their social rights and on all matters connected therewith so that common action for social progress can be taken by the Government. The Hon. the Leader of the House could still consider the case because he has stated that in principle he agrees that there is need for such a thing.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : I said that while I agreed in principle, lady Members of the Legislature could form themselves into an informal committee among themselves, and that a formal committee of the kind mentioned in the Resolution was not required.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : I hope hon. Members . . .

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Will accept my advice. (Laughter.)

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Hon. Members will remember what the Hon. the Leader of the House has said and I may tell Mrs. Clubwala Jadhav that I did consult her during the last session when I gave notice of the Resolution. But I never thought that the Resolution would be reached to-day. Otherwise, I would have told her in time about that. I am glad the lady Members appreciate the principle behind the Resolution. In view of the very interesting discussion that has taken place and the appeal made by the Hon. the Leader of the House, I have no objection to withdraw the Resolution.

[13th September 1958

* SRIMATHI MARY C. CLUBWALA JADHAV: May I say, Sir, that there is one disability women Members here suffer from? Whenever you announce the names of Members appointed to a committee, only one lady Member finds a place there and her name comes last in the list. That is a social disability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you consider it so, I shall put the name of the lady Member first every time. (Laughter.)

SRI V. V. RAMASWAMI: If it comes last, it shows that they are big enough to support all others above. (Laughter.)

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next and last Resolution relates to delimitation of Madras Graduates and Teachers Constituencies, given notice of by Sri K. M. Ramasamy Gounder. He is not here and he does not want the Resolution to be taken up to-day. So, the Resolution is deemed to have been withdrawn. He must give fresh notice of the Resolution.

The House will now adjourn and meet again at 3 p.m. on Wednesday, the 17th September 1958.

The House then adjourned.

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to starred question No. 22 put by Sri V. V. Ramaswami at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 13th September 1958, page 242 supra.]

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) The information is furnished below :—

Names of Members.

1. Officials—

(i) The Commissioner of Food Production, Madras—*Chairman.*

(ii) The Director of Agriculture, Madras—*Vice-Chairman.*

(iii) The Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Madras.

2. Non-officials for the current term—

(iv) Sri C. R. Ranganathan, I.F.C. (Retired), representing the Fertilizer Association of India.

(v) Sri V. S. Thiagaraja Mudaliar, M.A., President, Tanjore Co-operative Marketing Federation, Tiruvarur, representing Co-operative Societies.

(vi) Sri V. C. Subbiah Gounder, Vellaikinar, Coimbatore district, representing the progressive farmers.

(vii) Sri G. R. Govindarajulu, Peelamedu, Coimbatore, representing Distributors of Chemical Fertilizers.

Functions of the Committee.

To advise the Government on the following matters :—

(i) Implementation and review of the working of the Fertilizer (Control) Order, 1957;

(ii) selection of firms for inclusion in the approved list of manure mixing firms under the State Trading Scheme; and

(iii) any other matter connected with the supply and distribution of chemical fertilizers.

[13th September 1958

APPENDIX II

[Vide answer to starred question No. 25 put by Sri M. Ethirajalu at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 13th September 1958, page 244 supra.]

Nine applications for the provision of burial grounds were received by the Collector of South Arcot during 1957 and up to the end of May 1958 as detailed below :—

Name of village and taluk from which application was received.	*Year in which application was received.*	*Present stage.*
1 Chinnamambattu village in Kallakurichi taluk.	1957	Application has been sent to Tahsildar for inspection and report with necessary proposals.
2 Pattikudikadu village in Vridhachalam taluk.	1957	Proposals for acquisition have been received by the Collector of South Arcot and will be sent to the Government after inspection by the District Welfare Officer.
3 Avinangudi village in Vridhachalam taluk.	1957	Application has been sent to Tahsildar for inspection and report with necessary proposals.
4 Kadambur village in Gingee taluk.	1957	Orders have been passed for the transfer of an extent of 0·52 acre from patta into burial ground poramboke for the use of the Harijans.
5 Komarakudi village in Chidambaram taluk.	1957	An extent of 0·50 acre in R.S. No. 31/10 of Komarakudi village was ordered to be transferred from tope poramboke into burial ground for the use of the Harijans.
6 Panabakkam village in Tirukoilur taluk.	1957	Application has been sent to Tahsildar for inspection and report with necessary proposals.
7 Vadakuthu village in Cuddalore taluk. 8 & 9 Kolathur and Pallacheri villages in Tindivanam taluk.	1958	Proposals have been called for from the Special Revenue Inspectors concerned.